LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
4.11.27
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BS1225
.4.C7M12

AN EXAMINATION

OF

BP. COLENSO'S DIFFICULTIES.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 11 1927
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AN EXAMINATION

OF

BP. COLENSO'S DIFFICULTIES

WITH REGARD TO

THE PENTATEUCH;

AND

SOME REASONS FOR BELIEVING IN ITS AUTHENTICITY

AND DIVINE ORIGIN.

BY THE REV.

ALEXANDER McCAUL, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS,

KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

New Edition.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

1863.

PREFACE.

HAVING been requested by friends to furnish solutions to Bishop Colenso's difficulties, I hastened, as soon as health and leisure permitted, to examine his controversial statements, and now present the results of the examination. His lordship's preface has been left unnoticed, because the narrative contained in it *seems* to be beset with difficulties as grave as any which he has found in the Pentateuch. But, after the consideration of his objections to this sacred Book, I have thought it well to add some reasons for believing in its authenticity and Divine origin; and have therefore traced the outline of an argument, which all readers of the English Bible may fill up for themselves; and which may serve generally as

an answer to all objections. He who patiently follows the chain of testimony to the existence of the Pentateuch from Malachi to Joshua, will not waver in faith, even though he may not be able to solve all difficulties. He who bows to the witness of Christ and His Spirit in the New Testament, will not be troubled with doubts as to the veracity of the Mosaic narrative.

In this second part, the works of Graves, Faber, Jahn, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and I. M. Augustine Scholz, have been freely used.

To avoid the frequent repetition of the words "Bishop Colenso," the initial letters D. C. have been employed, B. C. having already a chronological appropriation.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introductory Remarks	1
The Family of Judah	3
Size of the Court of the Tabernacle	16
Moses and Joshua addressing all Israel	24
Extent of the Camp, Priest's Duties, &c.	32
The Number of the People, and the Poll-tax	39
The Israelites dwelling in Tents	46
The Israelites armed	49
The Institution of the Passover	56
The March out of Egypt	65
The Sheep and Cattle in the Desert	70
The Number of Israelites, and Extent of the Land of Canaan	80
The Number of the Firstborn	84
The Sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt	90
The Exodus in the Fourth Generation	92
The Number of Israelites at the Exodus	106

PAGE

The Danites and Levites at the time of the Exodus . 116
The Priests, their Duties, and their Perquisites . . 122
The Priests, and their Duties at the Celebration of the Passover 136
War on Midian 147
Our present Pentateuch that known to the Lord and His Apostles 156
Its existence traced back to Malachi 158
Testimony of Malachi and his Contemporaries . . . 161
Testimony of Ezekiel 163
Testimony of Jeremiah 167
Testimony of Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea 173
Testimony of the Books of Kings and Proverbs . . 185
Testimony of the Books of Samuel and Psalms . . 196
Testimony of Ruth and Judges 205

EXAMINATION,

&c.

FAITH in the inspiration of the Mosaic writings depends not upon satisfactory replies to objections, nor successful solutions of difficulties. The Pentateuch possesses the testimony of the Saviour's omniscience, and has stamped the evidence of its divine origin upon the annals of the world. From the present hour back to the days of Moses, its influence, and even its language, can be continuously traced in the theology of Christians, the traditions of Jews, the oracles of Hebrew prophets, and the records of Israelite historians. Its very necessity to the right understanding of the religious condition of man, at any period of the world's history for the last three thousand years, demonstrates its heavenly source. He, then, who believes the Gospel, or contemplates the gigantic and never-ceasing influence which the Pentateuch has exerted upon human thought, action, and conscience, will not be much disturbed

by difficulties of detail in a book of such remote antiquity, made up of detached portions of legislation, and fragments of history, written at intervals during the wanderings of the desert, amidst all the cares, troubles, and interruptions necessarily the lot of Israel's leader and deliverer, and, though inspired, bearing the unmistakable impress of the circumstances under which it was composed. In such a book there must be difficulties, as easily discerned by the believer as the unbeliever—and not a few have been noticed and explained, many centuries ago, by Christian fathers and Jewish Rabbis. In more modern times, Spinoza and the English Deists, the French philosophers and the German rationalists have increased their number; and Christian apologists, of various nations, have multiplied answers, so that now but little new can be said for or against the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch. Bishop Colenso's chief difficulties, such as that relating to Judah's grandchildren, the number of the children of Israel at the Exodus—the mode of finding sustenance for the cattle in the wilderness—the history of the fortieth year, have been discussed again and again. But as they are stated in a somewhat new form, and some minor objections added, an examination of the Bishop's whole argument became necessary. The results are now presented to the reader, and will show that

the objections propounded by Bishop Colenso are based, some on doubtful interpretations, others on suppression of, or additions to, the words of Scripture impugned, on unwarranted assumptions, or defective information. To range them under these rubrics would be perhaps the most interesting and most forcible method of showing their weakness, and would prevent repetitions. But it might not be considered so fair to the objector. It would certainly not be so convenient for reference; and in some cases would be difficult where unwarranted assumption, defective information, and doubtful interpretation are all combined. The objections, therefore, are reviewed in the order in which they are stated.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. II. *The Family of Judah.*

The first difficulty propounded by Bishop Colenso was not discovered by modern criticism, but was observed and explained centuries ago by Christian fathers and Jewish Rabbis. It relates to Judah's age and the birth-place of his grandchildren, Hezron and Hamul. As stated by D. C., the difficulty rests on two suppositions; first, that the historian meant to convey the idea that Hezron and Hamul were born in Canaan; secondly, that at the descent into Egypt, Judah's age was forty-two. First, then, as to the birth-

place of Judah's grandchildren. D. C., in section 19, quotes Gen. xlvi. 12, "And the sons of Judah, Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan; and the sons of Pharez, Hezron and Hamul"—and then says (the italics are D. C.'s)—

"It appears to me to be certain that the writer means to say that Hezron and Hamul were *born in the land of Canaan*, and were among the seventy persons (including Jacob himself, and Joseph, and his two sons), who *came into Egypt* with Jacob. He repeats the words again and again:—'These are the names of Israel, which *came into Egypt*,' v. 8; 'All the souls, that came *with Jacob into Egypt*, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, were threescore and six,' v. 26—which they would not be without Hezron and Hamul. 'And the sons of Joseph which were born him in Egypt were two souls; all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came *into Egypt*, were threescore and ten,' v. 27; 'These are the names of the children of Israel, which *came into Egypt;* every man and his household *came with Jacob.* And all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls: for Joseph was in Egypt already,' E. i. 1. 5." Now of all these texts which D. C. here accumulates, there is only one that seems to favour his view, the others serve to refute it. The verse apparently favourable is Gen. xlvi. 26,

"All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, were threescore and six"—and this seems favourable only in the English translation, not in the Hebrew text. The words "All the souls which came *with* Jacob into Egypt" seem to imply that these sixty-six were then all alive, and accompanied Jacob at the time. The stress of the argument lies upon the preposition "with," but that preposition does not exist in the Hebrew (neither *Eth* את nor *Im* עם), but another (ל), which signifies "To, Of, Belonging to," as is explained in the following verse, "All the souls of the house (לבית) of Jacob." The accurate translation therefore is, "All the souls of, or belonging to, Jacob, who came down into Egypt—were sixty-six." The text says nothing at all of their accompanying him, nor of the time at which they went down, but simply that they who went down were sixty-six. D. C. will, perhaps, ask—"Then why are these sixty-six separated from Joseph and his sons, of whom it is said in the following verse, 'And the sons of Joseph which were born to him in Egypt, were two souls?'" To which I reply, that they are not separated, except by those who divided the text into verses. The great object of the writer is to prove that the whole number of those who went down into Egypt is only seventy. He, therefore, carefully notes the number of each of Jacob's four families, and here comes to give the

sum total, and therefore verses 26 and 27 ought to be read together thus—"And all the souls of, or belonging to, Jacob, who came down into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, were threescore and six, and the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten." The subject of the proposition is "All the souls belonging to Jacob who came down into Egypt," in verse 26. The predicate is, "were threescore and ten," given in verse 27. But D. C. will perhaps say that in Exod. i. 1 the Hebrew has the preposition "with" where it is said "Every man and his household came with (את) Jacob." But there the names of those who had households (which Hezron and Hamul had not) are given, and they are those of the eleven sons of Jacob. The names of the grandchildren are not specified, nor is the number sixty-six given, but, on the contrary, the number "seventy," which includes Joseph and his sons, who certainly did not accompany Jacob into Egypt, for they were there already. There is therefore no passage which asserts that the sixty-six, including Hezron and Hamul, were alive, and went into Egypt at the time of Jacob's going down. The question therefore is reduced to this, What is meant by the words "came down into Egypt," or "went down into Egypt?" Do they mean, that

they who were born in Egypt, are excluded; or can they include those who had never been in Canaan at all, but were born in Egypt? Most certainly the latter, as is proved by the texts adduced by D. C. himself. First, we have Gen. xlvi. 27, "All the souls of the house of Jacob (הבאה), *which came into Egypt*, were threescore and ten," and secondly, Deut. x. 22, "Thy fathers went down (ירדו) into Egypt with threescore and ten persons." The number "threescore and ten" cannot be made out, without the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, who, in our occidental sense of the words, never "came," or "went down into Egypt" at all, but were born there. These two texts, therefore, prove that the words "came into Egypt" may include those born in Egypt, that they do actually include Ephraim and Manasseh, and may, therefore, also include Hamul and Hezron, and some of the ten persons, named as the sons of Benjamin, and thus this ground of D. C.'s objection is removed. It is nowhere stated that Hamul and Hezron accompanied Jacob —and the expressions "came" or "went down into Egypt" have a wide signification, including those who did not immigrate into Egypt, but were born there.

But it may be asked in what sense can it be said that persons, like Ephraim and Manasseh, who were born in Egypt, came into Egypt? The answer is, this must be ascertained by the author's

usus loquendi, and this chapter gives abundant *data*, showing that he predicates of the children, what is strictly true only of the parents, or, as Bishop Patrick says, "The Scripture speaks of parents and children as one person." Thus, for instance, the author relates how God said, v. 4, "I will go down with thee into Egypt, and I will surely bring thee up again," a promise fulfilled in the bringing up of Jacob's children at the Exodus. Again, in recounting the children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren of Leah, he says, verse 15, "These be the sons of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-aram, with his daughter Dinah: all the souls of his sons and daughters were thirty-three." According to this statement, if taken literally, Pharez and Zarah, Hezron and Hamul were born in Padan-aram, and out of these words D. C. might have made a much grander difficulty than that which he has selected. That he has not done so is a proof that D. C. knows and understands the Scripture peculiarity of speaking of father and children as one person. Indeed, he not only admits, but contends for that principle in a very remarkable example. In Exod. xii. 40 it is written, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." D. C. takes much pains, and devotes a whole chapter, to prove that the author must mean "the entire sojourning of them and their

forefathers, Abraham and Isaac, 'in a strange land,' both in Canaan and Egypt"—that is, that the Scripture identifies parents and children as one person, and, therefore, in this passage, Exod. xii. 40, predicates of the children of Israel, that which is only true, when spoken of them and their fathers collectively. What D. C. here affirms where it suits his own view, he will hardly deny, when it occurs elsewhere. He must admit therefore that Ephraim and Manasseh, according to the author's view, went down into Egypt, when their father Joseph, or their grandfather Jacob went—and if this sense be certain in their case, it must be admitted to be possible in that of Hezron and Hamul, and others. And let it be remembered that this principle is not new—that it has not been invented in modern times to get rid of difficulties started by modern criticism. D. C. shows that in the case of the four hundred and thirty years it is employed both by the Samaritans and the LXX, i. e. more than two thousand years ago. The same principle is also taken for granted in the LXX account of those who went down into Egypt. They translate v. 26, as our English version does, "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt." But they include amongst those who thus came down, the grandsons, and one great-grandson of Benjamin, who must have been born in Egypt; and amongst the posterity of Joseph they include grandsons

and great-grandsons, who were confessedly born in that country, and then v. 27 sum up thus, "And the sons of Joseph which were born to him in Egypt nine souls; all the souls of the house of Jacob who came *with Jacob* into Egypt, seventy-five souls." Here they have added the words "with Jacob," and make the total seventy-five, proving thereby that they considered that Jacob's grandchildren and great-grandchildren, though born in Egypt after his arrival there, may be said to have come into Egypt with Jacob. So that even if the English version were correct, the application of the Scripture usage of speaking of parent and children as one person would still remove the difficulty. Hezron and Hamul may have been born in Egypt, and, therefore, even if D. C.'s calculation that Judah was only forty-two at the descent into Egypt be correct, there is no difficulty in the narrative, much less any thing to affect its historic character. But it may be asked why these two, Hezron and Hamul, are mentioned, and not others of Jacob's great-grandchildren? The answer is obvious, because they were amongst the original seventy progenitors from whom the following generations of Israel sprang. About this number "seventy," the author is evidently very anxious, and therefore is not content with repeating it again and again, but also gives the name of each of the whole number. Had Er and Onan lived, there would have been

seventy without them. But as they died, Hezron and Hamul appear to have been adopted in their stead, and in verse 12, Er and Onan seem to have been mentioned only to show that they were so. The author begins by saying, v. 8, "These are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt." But Er and Onan never came into Egypt, and yet when he mentions Judah and his children, v. 12, he says, "And the sons of Judah, Er and Onan, and Shelah and Pharez, and Zarah; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, and there arose (ויהיו, ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Φαρὲς Ἐσρὼν καὶ Ἰεμουήλ) the sons of Pharez, Hezron and Hamul." The English translation has "and the sons of Pharez *were* Hezron and Hamul." But the word "were" does not express the force of the Hebrew ויהיו. Er and Onan died, but Hezron and Hamul were raised up. They became what Er and Onan might have been, and were numbered amongst those seventy worthies, who were the progenitors of Israel.

Having shown that even if Judah were only forty-two years old, there is no real difficulty, it may seem to be superfluous to discuss Judah's age, and yet it may be useful to show that D. C.'s calculation here is by no means certain. He reckons thus:—

"Joseph was thirty years old, when he 'stood before Pharaoh' as governor of the land of Egypt, Gen. xli. 46; and from that time nine

years elapsed (seven of plenty and two of famine) before Jacob came down to Egypt. At that time, therefore, Joseph was thirty-nine years old. But Judah was about three years older than Joseph; for Judah was born in the *fourth* year of Jacob's double marriage, Gen. xxix. 35, and Joseph in the *seventh*, Gen. xxx. 24—26; xxxi. 41. Hence Judah was forty-two years old when Jacob went down to Egypt."

The necessity of this calculation, that Joseph was born in the seventh year, depends on the supposition that Jacob was only twenty years in Mesopotamia. Jacob's words in Gen. xxxi. 38—41, clearly assert that he was twenty years in the service, and in the household or family of Laban; but do not say that he was not longer in Mesopotamia[1]. They assert further that those twenty years consisted of two parts, fourteen years of servitude for the daughters, and six years for the cattle; but do not say that the six years began as soon as the fourteen ended. Neither does the narrative say, that immediately at the end of the fourteen years Jacob wished to go away. It is not said, "When the fourteen years were ended, Jacob said to Laban, Send me away." But "When Rachel had borne Joseph, Jacob

[1] "Thus have I been twenty years in thy house" does not necessarily mean Laban's dwelling-house, because, as keeping the cattle, Jacob must have been mostly away from home in the pasturing-places.

said unto Laban, Send me away . . . . Give me my wives and my children, for whom I have served thee, and let me go; for thou, thou knowest [2] my service which I have done thee." The words rather imply that Laban detained him against his will, and would not give him his wives; conduct quite in conformity with Laban's other dealings. If so, there must have been an interval between the ending of the fourteen years and the new bargain respecting the cattle. An interval of this kind is also demanded by the narrative, for we are told, xxix. 35, that after the birth of Judah, Leah "left bearing;" and, xxxi. 9, that "when Leah saw that she had left bearing, she took Zilpah her maid, and gave her to Jacob." Now, how long would it be from the birth of Judah before she came to the conclusion that she had left bearing? Two years at least. From the birth to the weaning of Judah it is not unreasonable to reckon a year: then another year of hope, perhaps a second, as she would not hastily make up her mind to raise up to herself another rival in her husband's affections. This would bring us to the sixth or seventh year of the double marriage; then two years for the birth of Zilpah's children, Gad and Asher, make eight or nine years. Then comes the growing up of Reuben, the finding of the mandrakes, and the

[2] אתה ידעת.

birth of Issachar and Zebulun, for which two to three years are required. "And afterwards (how long afterwards is not said, but 'afterwards' implies that it did not happen immediately) she bare a daughter, Dinah," for which another year must be allowed. Then follows the history of the birth of Joseph. If it is related in chronological order, then it could not have taken place before the eleventh or twelfth year of the double marriage. That it took place sooner cannot be proved, as there is no certain note of time as to when it happened. But if the events be related in chronological order, then Judah must have been at least seven years older than Joseph, perhaps eight or nine. Therefore, when Joseph was thirty, Judah must have been thirty-seven or more, and not thirty-three, as D. C. supposes. Then, again, to make Judah forty-two at the time of the immigration, D. C. is obliged to reckon only nine years from the interpretation of the dreams to the descent of Jacob into Egypt, allowing no interval between the interpretation of the dreams and the beginning of the year of plenty. But there must have been at least one year; for, after the interpretation, Joseph was exalted, then he was married, and had, of course, to arrange his house and household. After that he went out over all the land of Egypt, to make preparations for storing the corn in the land of Egypt, and to appoint the officers who should do it. For these

things a year must be allowed. Then come the nine years,—making, together, ten. So that when Jacob came into Egypt Judah must have been forty-eight or forty-nine. But whatever his age, sufficient reason has been given to show that he was considerably more than forty-two; and that, therefore, the second plea on which D. C. founds his objections has not a more sure foundation than the first. The first rests upon a wrong interpretation of the words of the historian; the second, on a calculation inconsistent with the course and requirements of the facts related; therefore neither can affect the historic character of the narrative. This is all that is strictly required as an answer. But it may be well to add, that if Judah were forty-nine, there can be no difficulty about his having grandchildren, even under the peculiar circumstances of the case. Aben Ezra has shown that Judah's marriage did not take place when Joseph was sold, but may have occurred some years before. A marriage at sixteen, and similar marriages of his sons, would make it possible to have grandchildren. It is hardly necessary to remark, that such marriages are common in the East. They were the usual marriages among the Polish Jews until lately, boys commonly marrying in their fifteenth year. But they are not uncommon elsewhere. Edwy, Edgar, Edward I., Edward III., Prince Arthur, son of Henry VII., all married about fifteen or

sixteen. And a friend reminds me that Edward the Black Prince was born three months before his father had completed his seventeenth year.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. IV. *Size of the Court of the Tabernacle.*

D. C.'s next objection is found in his fourth chapter, and refers to Levit. viii. 1—4, "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying . . . . Gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation. And Moses did as Jehovah commanded him. And the assembly was gathered unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation."

Upon these words D. C. observes, first, that "congregation must mean" the whole body of the people—at all events, the adult males in the prime of life among them—and not merely the heads of the people, "that is, at least 600,000 persons." Secondly, that the words of the historian imply "that they must all have come within the court." Thirdly, that the court was only one hundred and eighty feet long and ninety broad, and therefore could not hold 600,000 persons. Fourthly, that "if they were to stand as closely as possible, in front, not merely of *the door*, but of the whole *end* of the Tabernacle in which the door was, they would have reached nearly twenty miles."

D. C.'s first assertion is freely admitted. "All the congregation" means "all the congregation," not merely the 600,000 adult males, but women and children. The whole congregation was convoked or summoned (for that is the meaning of the Hebrew word *haqhel*, rendered "Gather thou" by our English translators). And all thus convoked, who were not prevented, turned out of their tents to assist at a great national ceremony, the consecration of the Aaronic priesthood. But the assertion that the historian's words imply that this vast multitude all entered the court is as contrary to common sense as to the meaning of the language employed. Even on infidel grounds, D. C.'s assertion is utterly incredible. Sceptical critics suppose that the book of Leviticus was written before the building of the Temple, whilst the Tabernacle was still standing, by a priest who was interested in and well acquainted with it; who therefore knew the size of the court, not only by measurement, but by the daily performance of the duties of his office, much better than D. C. himself. That such an one should mean that all the congregation entered into the court every time that they are said to have been gathered to the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation, is simply impossible. The author is at least a man of education, intimately acquainted with the sacrificial laws, and

not ignorant of arithmetic and mensuration. He was, therefore, not a fool; neither, if a knave, did he write for a nation of fools. The people knew the size of the court as well as the author, and therefore he could never have intended to impose upon the people a story so palpably absurd, ridiculous, and contrary to their own personal experience. Indeed, every one possessed of ordinary understanding wonders how any educated man could have so misunderstood the author's words, even as they are represented in the English version. When the daily papers report that a great crowd was collected at the door of the House of Lords, or of a Police Court, or of St. Paul's, no one supposes that the reporter meant to say that they were all in contact with the door, or even in front; nor would the most hypercritical reject the report as unhistorical. In like manner, when people of common sense have read that "the assembly was gathered unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation," they have understood that as many as could of this great multitude stood at the door; that the princes, elders, and officers had precedency, as is mentioned Levit. ix. 1; that the rest stood behind and about, with their faces turned to the Tabernacle, knowing what was going on, and expecting some manifestation of the Lord's presence, in which they were not disappointed, as at

the end of the ceremonies on the eighth day "the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people."

But this is not merely the sense derived by ordinary readers from reading the account in the vernacular, but also that of great critics, who, though not believing in the Pentateuch as inspired, have had too much knowledge of the original language, and too much good sense, to propound any thing so absurd.

Gesenius, in his "Lexicon," explaining the meaning of the Hebrew words rendered "Unto the door," says, first, of the preposition "Unto," (Heb. *el* אל), "A preposition signifying in general *to tend, or verge to, or towards*, whether one reaches and so enters the place, or not." And under the word *Pethach* (פתח) "door," translates the two words "El Pethach," "Towards the door;" so that, according to him, the meaning of the words commented on by D. C. is, "All the assembly was gathered towards the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation." Knobel, one of the most acute critics and profound Hebrew scholars living, though also unhappily a Rationalist, gives the same sense. In his commentary on the passage, he says, "Moses was to take, that is, to cause Aaron and his sons to be brought .... and at the same time to assemble the people *before* the Tabernacle of the congregation;" so that he understood the assem-

bling of the people to the door of the Tabernacle to mean simply their being gathered in front of the Tabernacle, not their being crowded into the court.

That this is the true sense can be satisfactorily proved from other passages of Scripture. Thus, in Numbers x. 3, we read, "And when they shall blow with them (the silver trumpets), all the assembly (or congregation, the same word in Hebrew) shall assemble themselves to Thee at (unto) the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation."

Now, according to D. C.'s exegesis, these words present a more terrible difficulty than the other. Moses, as a full-grown man, occupied, as D. C. calculates, a space of two feet; therefore, only one full-grown man could be gathered to Moses, and stand before him: the whole congregation would, therefore, have to stand in single file; and thus, if when they stood nine abreast they required twenty miles, would in this case require one hundred and eighty miles! The patent absurdity of such reasoning proves that Moses's meaning cannot be that ascribed to him by D. C., but must be that suggested by common sense and Hebrew scholarship. Similar language with a similar meaning is found in the other books of the Old Testament; as 1 Kings viii. 2, we read, "And all the men of Israel assembled themselves unto King Solomon." Here no sane

person would think of applying D. C.'s two-foot measure; or suppose the historian meant to say that all the men of Israel stood in single file before the king in a line extending more than two hundred miles.

D. C. seems to have been misled to his strange interpretation by understanding "the Tabernacle of the congregation," to mean a place in which the people congregated; and overlooking the true meaning of the Hebrew words *ohel hammoed*, as explained by God Himself. The words mean "the tent of meeting," the place where the people met God, and God met the people, as set forth in more than one place of the Pentateuch. Thus, in Exod. xxv. 21, 22, the Lord says to Moses, "And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I will give thee. There will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." What is here promised to Moses is, in Exod. xxix. 42—44, promised to the children of Israel. "This shall be a continual burnt-offering throughout your generations at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; where I will meet with you, to speak there unto thee. And there will I meet with the children of Israel, and the Tabernacle shall be sanctified by My glory,

and I will sanctify the Tabernacle of meeting." From the former passage we learn that it was from the mercy-seat that the Lord spake, and that there He manifested His glory. But as the mercy-seat was in the Holy of Holies, whither none but the High Priest was admitted, it is plain that when the Lord met with the children of Israel they must have stood outside. The children of Israel, therefore, met the Lord by assembling before the Tabernacle of the congregation, or meeting. The Lord met them by displaying His glory; and He spake to them by speaking first to Aaron, and subsequently to the High Priests admitted within. Thus the Tabernacle of congregation, or meeting, was not the place in which, but to which, the people assembled to meet the Lord. (Compare also Exod. xxx. 6. 36, and Numb. xvii. 4.) Another proof that D. C. is imperfectly acquainted with what he criticizes is found in his ignorance of the construction of the Tabernacle, and of the language in which it is described. It is true that in this particular case his ignorance does not affect his argument, but it does affect belief in his competence for the task which he has undertaken of destroying the old faith, and giving us a new religion instead. On p. 33, he says:—

"Supposing, then, that 'all the congregation' of adult males in the prime of life . . . . had hastened to take their stand side by side, as closely

as possible, in front not merely of the *door*, but of the whole *end* of the Tabernacle in which the door was, &c." Here, by his words and italics, he evidently makes a distinction between *the door*, and the *end* of the Tabernacle in which, as he says, the door was. He thinks that the end was of the nature of a wall or partition, in which the door was hung. But had he carefully read the account of the construction of the Tabernacle, or understood the meaning of the word "Pethach," here translated *door*, he would have known that no distinction of the kind can be made, but that the *end* of the Tabernacle is itself what our translators have called the *door*. The word *Pethach* signifies *opening*, and is therefore used of the opening of a tent, or entrance, as well as of a *doorway*. So with regard to the tent or Tabernacle of the congregation, the end through which the priests went into the Holy Place was entirely open, and the opening is called *Pethach*. When it was to be closed, it was not by means of a door hung in the end, but by a hanging drawn across, Exod. xxxvi. 37, and called *Masakh*[3]. For *door* in our signification the Hebrew has another word, *Deleth*, from *Dalah*, to hang. Our translators were not ignorant of the difference, as appears from their translation of Gen. xviii. 1, where they say of

[3] In the Holy Land, the Tabernacle had *doors* (Dalthoth) added to it. See 1 Sam. i. 9, and iii. 15.

Abraham, "He sat *in* the tent door;" not "at the door." "In the tent door" can only mean in the opening. But the English translators thought that on the whole the word *door* was the most intelligible for the general reader. The error of D. C., both with regard to the structure of the Tabernacle, and the meaning of the Hebrew words, indicates a want of accuracy fatal to his pretensions as a critic.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. V. *Moses and Joshua addressing all Israel.*

In this chapter D. C. proceeds to object to the accounts of Moses and Joshua addressing the people. He first quotes the following verses:— "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel," Deut. i. 1. "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them," Deut. v. 1. "And afterwards, he, Joshua, read all the words of the Law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that which is written in the Book of the Law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." Josh. viii. 34, 35.

Upon these passages he asks, "How is it conceivable that a man should do what Joshua is here said to have done, unless, indeed, the read-

ing 'every word of all that Moses commanded, with the blessings and the cursings, according to all that is written in the Book of the Law,' was a mere dumb show, without the least idea of those most solemn words being *heard* by those to whom they were addressed? For, surely no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people as large as the whole population of London."—His reasoning amounts to this: Joshua is said to have read before 2,000,000 of people, that multitude could not all hear, therefore the Pentateuch is unhistoric. Now, in the first place, the same reasoning will prove that the history of the Council of Clermont is also a fiction. The historian thus describes it:—"Besides his court and council of Roman cardinals, he (Urban) was supported by 13 archbishops and 225 bishops; the number of mitred prelates was computed at 400. . . . . From the adjacent kingdoms, a martial train of lords and knights attended the council . . . . and such was the ardour of zeal and curiosity, that the city was filled, and many thousands in the month of November erected their tents or huts in the open field. . . . . From the synod of Placentia, the rumour of his great design had gone forth among the nations. The clergy on their return had preached in every diocese the merit and glory of the Holy Land; and when the Pope ascended a lofty scaffold in the market-place of Clermont, his

eloquence was addressed to a well-prepared and impatient audience. His topics were obvious, his exhortation was vehement, his success inevitable. The orator was interrupted by the shout of thousands, who, with one voice, and in their rustic idiom, exclaimed aloud, 'God wills it, God wills it.'" Now here a petty caviller might urge many objections. He might ask, Did the thousands in the fields bring their tents with them? How could they find materials to build huts? But as to hearing Urban's address, how could the thousands in the fields, far from the market-place, hear one syllable of what was spoken, or cry with one voice in approval?

The cardinals, bishops, clergy, knights, and nobility, would occupy the space near the Pope. The inhabitants, many thousands in number[4], would fill the streets. The crowd of strangers who were in the fields, were thus hopelessly excluded even from catching the sound of Urban's voice, and could not interrupt him with any shouts of consent. The whole story, on Colenso's principle, is from its impossibility absurd and unhistoric, a mere fiction of that credulous writer Edward Gibbon. D. C. will perhaps say that there is no comparison between the account of many thousands and two millions: to which the reply is obvious. An impossibility is an impossibility

[4] The population of Clermont was 26,738 in the year 1846.

whether it relates to twenty thousand or to twenty millions. Every common-sense reader of Gibbon will easily understand and explain his words, so as to be perfectly credible and accurately historical; and, if he be consistent, will interpret this account of Joshua with the same candour and the same unconsciousness of difficulty.

In the second place, D. C.'s assertion, that if the people could not hear, the whole proceeding was a mere dumb show, by which we suppose he means a useless and unprofitable ceremony, is by no means true. The people knew that this reading had been commanded by God, and that Joshua was performing a solemn religious act. If all could not hear, it was certain that some thousands could, placed as they were before Joshua. The people knew what the blessings and the cursings were, and therefore, when the Amen of those that stood in front rose with a mighty sound, could well join, being moved with the fear of that Divine Majesty, whose voice they had heard at Sinai, and whose mercy had given them a possession in the land of promise. The solemn reading before the congregation was a great constitutional act, the ratification, on the part of the new generation, of the covenant with God, their solemn acceptance of that Divine Law by which they were to be governed. For, as Hooker has observed, "The Almighty himself could not impose a law, but asked for the assent

of the people. That assent was given by the old generation, when they stood at Sinai, and said, 'All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.' Now, in the promised land, it was proclaimed in the Amens of the whole congregation. Besides, the public reading of the Law before the whole multitude of Israel, men, women, and children, even if they could not hear a word, was not an unmeaning ceremony, but a solemn and public assurance that the Divine Law was not the exclusive property of priests or rulers, or of the males, as the Rabbis and some Christians would make us believe, but the inheritance of the whole congregation; and that every soul of the house of Israel, male and female, old and young, had a right and a duty to read and make him or herself acquainted with it, and therefore it was also written on stones prepared for the purpose that when the solemn and public act, assuring every soul of his privilege and his responsibility was over, he might approach the stones and read.'

But, in the third place, we have sufficient testimony to prove, that, situated as Joshua and the tribes of Israel were, he could be heard. Bishop Colenso's confident assertion, that "no human voice, unless strengthened by miracle, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people as large as the whole population of LONDON, proceeds merely from want of information. He is either ignorant, or in his hastiness has over

looked the nature of the locality where the reading took place. Half of the tribes stood on Gerizim, the other six on Ebal: in the narrow space between stood Joshua and the Levites. "Imagine," says that accurate American scholar, Dr. Thomson, "that the lofty range of mountains running north and south was cleft open to its base by some tremendous convulsion of nature, at right angles to its own line of extension, and the broad fissure thus made is the vale of Nablous . . . . Mount Ebal is on the north, Gerizim on the south, and the city between. Near the eastern end the vale is not more than sixty rods wide; and just here, I suppose, the tribes assembled to hear 'the blessings and the cursings' read by the Levites. We have them *in extenso* in the 27th and 28th chapters of Deuteronomy; and in Joshua, we are informed that it was actually done, and how Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Joseph, and Benjamin, stood on Gerizim; and Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zebulon, Dan, and Naphtali, on Ebal; while 'all Israel, and their elders and officers, and their judges, stood on this side of the ark, and on that side before the priests, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord:' the whole nation, with the women and the little ones, were there. 'And Joshua read all the words of the Law, the blessings and the cursings; there was not one word of all that Moses commanded, which

Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel.' This was beyond question or comparison the most august assembly the sun ever shone upon; and I never stand in the narrow plain with Ebal and Gerizim rising on either hand to the sky, without involuntarily recalling and reproducing the scene. I have shouted to hear the echo, and then fancied how it must have been, when the loud-voiced Levites proclaimed from the naked cliffs of Ebal, 'Cursed be any man that maketh a graven image, an abomination unto Jehovah,' and then the tremendous AMEN! tenfold louder from the mighty congregation, rising and swelling from Ebal to Gerizim, and from Gerizim to Ebal[5]."

Similar is the testimony of another thoughtful and learned student of the sacred text, Dr. H. Bonar. "The two mountains," says he, "look very near each other, though one is deceived as to distances here. Yet it did not seem an unlikely thing that parties should answer each other from those heights. I asked, especially as to this,

[5] The Land and the Book, p. 470. What immediately follows respecting the writing of the Law on stones is also worth reading. Indeed the whole volume is one of the most delightful and instructive books I know. And if any one wants a volume of evidences, let him quietly read this through. I cannot imagine any one rising from its perusal without being convinced of the authenticity of the Old Testament.

Mr. Rogers, the excellent consul of Khaifa, who is at present here on business. He mentioned that it is quite a common thing for the villagers to call to each other from the opposite hills, and that the voice is heard quite distinctly. Having already found in the desert how far sound is carried, I did not think the distance between Ebal and Gerizim at all greater than between some of those places where we had already tried our voices; and I thought I could have undertaken to make known my wishes to any shepherd and fellah on yon rock, had there been one there at the time, or could I have addressed him in his native tongue." He adds in a note, "If Jotham's voice were at all like that of his people to this day, clear and shrill, he would find it easy enough to stand on the top of Gerizim, and call down to the inhabitants of the city beneath, 'Hearken unto me, ye men of Shechem, that my God may hearken unto you.' Judges ix. 7[6]."

Now, if the voice can be distinctly heard from Gerizim to Ebal, that of Joshua, who stood midway between the two, might be heard by the multitude, who stood before him, on the slopes of the hills: and thus Bishop Colenso's objection is found to be nothing more than an ebullition of zeal without knowledge.

[6] Dr. Bonar's "Land of Promise," p. 371. Bishop Colenso might also have gleaned this information from Dr. Stanley's "Sinai and Palestine," note 2, p. 237.

But we cannot pass on to the next objection without noticing an insinuation at the close of this paragraph. The Bishop says, "Nor can it be supposed that he read them first to one party, and then to another, &c., till all the congregation had heard them. The day would not have sufficed for reading in this way 'all the blessings and the cursings,' in Deut. xxvii., xxviii., much less 'all the words of the Law,' many times over, especially after that he had been already engaged, as the story implies, on the very same day, in writing 'a copy of the Law of Moses,' upon the stones set up in Mount Ebal. Josh. viii. 32, 33." Bishop Colenso, not finding enough in the Sacred Text to form a direct straightforward objection, has here condescended to employ that most unworthy mode of attack, an insinuation. To understand how baseless it is, read the narrative, and observe that in it there is no note of time whatever. For aught that is said in the text, Joshua might have taken a week or a month to write the Law, and another to read it before the people.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. VII. *Extent of the Camp, Priest's Duties, &c.*

The next objection is founded on the English version of Levit. iv. 11, 12, "And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head and

with his legs, and with his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock, shall he [the priest[7]] carry forth without the camp to a clean place." After enlarging on the size of the camp, and quoting Thomas Scott's opinion, that it must have formed a moveable city of twelve miles square, and therefore have been as large as London, he says:—

"In that case, the offal of these sacrifices would have had to be carried by Aaron himself, or one of his sons, a distance of six miles . . . . In fact, we have to imagine the Priest having himself to carry *on his back on foot*, from St. Paul's to the outskirts of the Metropolis, 'the skin, and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung,' even the whole bullock."

Here we have to charge Bishop Colenso with something worse than want of common sense, with unauthorized addition to the words of Scripture, in order to excite the profane mirth of his readers, by exhibiting a ridiculous picture of the Priest "on foot," carrying the whole bullock "ON HIS BACK." Bishop Colenso well knows that the words "on foot," and "on his back," are not in the text. He has added them gratuitously to exaggerate the difficulty. Wilful addition to the words of the author is as inconsistent with that love of truth which the Bishop so often professes, as ridicule is with respect for the opinions

[7] Bp. Colenso's insertion; the words are not in the English Version, nor in the Hebrew Text.

of others, and unwillingness to give unnecessary pain. Indeed, profane humour is incompatible with that seriousness of mind which is indispensable in the investigation of truth. It is bad enough in Voltaire, but quite unworthy of the sacred office of a Bishop. The objection itself is as absurd, as the mode of stating it is offensive to good taste. Even as the English version stands, a reasonable man would infer that the Priest, one of the highest dignitaries in the congregation of Israel, might have this work performed by some one else without personal service. But by insisting that the word "carry" means transportation *on his back*, and *on foot*, D. C. betrays his ignorance both of the English language and the Hebrew text. In the Bible itself, our English translators have often used the word "carry," where it is impossible to suppose that it means bearing on the back. Thus, in 2 Sam. vi. 10, we read, "And David carried it (the ark of the covenant) aside into the house of Obed-Edom." We know that David was not permitted to lay a finger on the ark; he therefore could not have carried it himself. So 1 Chron. v. 26, it is said of Tilgath-pilneser, "he carried them away, even the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, and brought them to Halah, and Habor, and Hara, &c.," and of Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings xxiv. 14, that he "carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all

the mighty men of valour, ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths." D. C. will hardly contend that these transportations were effected on foot on the backs of the Kings of Assyria and Babylon, and that, therefore, these narratives are unhistoric. But this use of the word "carry" is not confined to the Bible:

> "I would the college of cardinals
> Would choose him pope, and carry him to Rome,"

is the wish of Queen Margaret as expressed by Shakespeare.

Robertson also relates, how, after the battle of Mohacz, "Solyman, after his victory, seized and kept possession of several towns of the greatest strength in the southern provinces of Hungary, and, overrunning the rest of the country, carried near two hundred thousand persons into captivity." Now suppose some arithmetical critic were to object to this account, that the circumstance here related is impossible, that it would take so many, say ten, days for Solyman to carry one person on his back, on foot, to the nearest Turkish province, and five days to return; that it would therefore take him three million days, or more than eight thousand two hundred and nineteen years, to carry the two hundred thousand persons into captivity; and hence conclude, that the narrative is unhistoric, and unworthy of credit. What would D. C. himself reply to such a critic?

He might at first, perhaps, be tempted to laugh, but would ultimately mourn over the unhappy wreck of intellect betrayed in such misunderstanding of plain English, and such an ill-timed and preposterous display of arithmetical power.

But D. C. has not only mistaken the meaning of plain English, he has also overlooked the meaning of the Hebrew word translated "he shall carry forth." To make this plain to the English reader it is necessary to remark, that in Hebrew the form of the verb can be so modified as to cause a modification of the original idea: as in English the sense of the verb "fall," by changing the vowel *a* into *e*, "fell," is modified, and signifies "to cause to fall," e. g. "to fell trees." One of these Hebrew modifications is called Hiphil, and gives a causative sense. Thus, *kadash. to be holy*, hikdish, "to cause to be holy, to sanctify[8]." Now the Hebrew word *hotsi*, translated

[8] The fullest explanation of the meaning of Hiphil i found in Nordheim's Grammar, "Signification of Hiphil § 148. This species denotes the *causing* or *permitting* o the action signified by the primitive Kal. If the verb i Kal is transitive .... the Hiphil will denote the causin by its own subject of the performance of the action by an other subject on an object expressed or understood ... e. g., הִקְטִיל, *to cause or allow one to kill* another .... Whe Kal is neuter or intransitive .... the Hiphil species signifies the causing or permitting of such state or action, and consequently transitive, e. g., רָבָה, *to be many*, הִרְבָּה,

"he shall carry forth," is just such a modification. The original verb *yatsa* signifies "to go forth"—the Hiphil modification used here, "to cause to go forth." The literal translation, therefore, would be, "And he shall cause the whole bullock to go forth to without the camp," which affords not a shadow of a ground for D. C.'s misinterpretation, that the Priest was to carry it himself on his back on foot. The command is simply that "he shall cause it to go forth." The *how* is left at the Priest's own discretion. He might cause it to go forth, or to be removed by human agency, or by waggon, or by beasts of burden. There is nothing prescribed as to the mode, and, doubtless, the Priest would choose the instrumentality dictated by convenience and propriety. There is a similar instance in Lev. xiv. 44, 45, which ought to have convinced D. C. of the incorrectness of his interpretation. There it is said, "Then the priest shall come and look, and, behold, if the plague be spread in the house, it is a fretting leprosy in the house: it is unclean. And he shall break down the house, the stones of it and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house; and he shall carry them forth (*v'hotsi*) [he shall cause to go forth] out of the city into an unclean place." Can D. C. imagine that the

make many, to multiply, &c. &c."—Nordheim's "Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language," vol. i. p. 105, New York, 1842.

Priest was to do all this personally, and thus act, not only as conductor of public worship, but at the same time as bricklayer and scavenger, and not be allowed even the convenience of a cart, but carry all the stones and timber, &c., on his back on foot? With just as much reason as he might believe that God commanded Moses to carry all the children of Israel on his back out of Egypt, because it is said, Exod. iii. 10, "Come now, therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, and cause them to go forth [the same word, *v'hotse*] my people out of Egypt[9]."

Hitherto we have argued as if the words "he shall carry forth" were addressed to the Priest. But if D. C. be a Hebrew scholar he must know, on mere grammatical grounds, that this is by no means certain, that the third person preterite of the verb is often used impersonally, and that it is so rendered by modern versions as well as the LXX. As in the French version of Lev. xiv. 44, 45, "Le sacrificateur y entrera, et la regardera: et s'il voit que la plaie soit crue dans la maison; c'est une lèpre rongéante dans la maison: elle est souillée. On démolira donc la maison, ses pierres, son bois, avec tout son mortier, et on les transportera hors de la ville." According to this translation, fully justified by Hebrew usage,

[9] For further discussion on this subject see "Bishop Colenso's Criticism criticised," by the Rev. J. B. M'Caul, p. 9.

the Priest is to come and look, others are to break down the house, and carry away the materials. And this is the sense given by Luther, by Zunz, Fürst, &c. It is also the sense known to the LXX, 2000 years ago, as, according to the best reading, they have in Lev. iv. 12, ἐξοίσουσιν, "they shall carry out," and in Lev. xiv. 45, καὶ καθελοῦσι τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ τὰ ξύλα αὐτῆς, καὶ τοὺς λίθους αὐτῆς, καὶ πάντα τὸν χοῦν ἐξοίσουσιν[10]. Thus, whether we look to the meaning of the word "carry," as used by our English translators, or to its common use in English poets and historians, or to the meaning of the Hebrew word *hotsi*, or to interpretations ancient and modern, we find abundant reason for rejecting D. C.'s interpretation and his objection founded on it, as equally opposed to common sense, to Hebrew usage and grammar, and, we may add, to authority; for amidst all the translators, critics, scoffers, and objectors to the Pentateuch, so far as I know, not one has ever before put forth this absurdity.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. VII. *The Number of the People, and the Poll-tax.*

Doctor Colenso's next objection, in his seventh chapter, is founded on Exod. xxx. 11—13, and

[10] Tischendorf's Edition, in loc.

we first print this passage as he has given it on page 41.

"And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel, after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto Jehovah when thou numberest them, that there be no plague among them when thou numberest them. This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary; an half-shekel shall be the offering of Jehovah." Upon which D. C. comments thus: "We may first notice in passing, that the expression, 'shekel of the sanctuary,' could hardly have been used in this way until there *was* a sanctuary in existence, or rather until the sanctuary had been *some time* in existence, and such a phrase had become familiar in the mouths of the people. Whereas here it is put into the mouth of Jehovah, speaking to Moses on Mount Sinai, six or seven months before the tabernacle was made."

As in the last objection we had to complain of unauthorized additions to the text, here we have to notice a grave omission, without which the objection would lose all plausibility. Let the reader open his Bible, and he will see that D. C. has, in verse 13, left out the words, "A shekel is twenty gerahs." In the English Bible the verse stands thus: "This they shall give, every

one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: (a shekel is twenty gerahs:) an half-shekel shall be the offering to the Lord." This is the first place in the Bible where the phrase "shekel of the sanctuary," or "sacred shekel," occurs, the first time that the command respecting it is communicated to Moses; an explanation therefore was required, and is accordingly given in the words, "A shekel is twenty gerahs," and the explanation necessarily implies that up to this time the sacred shekel was unknown. These words could not therefore have been spoken or written, when the sanctuary had been some time in existence, and the phrase, "shekel of the sanctuary," had become familiar in the mouths of the people. At such a time the value would have been known, and the explanation superfluous. But now, when the tabernacle was about to be erected, and these half-shekels were to be used in its construction for the silver sockets, the Lord prescribes a sacred shekel and defines its value, thus proving that up to that time the sacred shekel was unknown. It would perhaps be unjust to accuse D. C. of wilfully suppressing what takes away the force of his objection. The omission may be ascribed to the precipitancy with which his criticism has proceeded, and that strong bias of the mind to mark difficulties without perceiving that

the means of removing them is found in the context.

But D. C.'s main objection to this passage of Scripture is thus expressed:—

"These words direct that whenever a numbering of the people shall take place, each shall pay a 'ransom for his soul' of half a shekel. Now in Exod. xxxviii. 26, we read of such a tribute being paid, 'a bekah for every man, that is, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary, for every one that went to be numbered, from twenty years old and upward,' that is, the *atonement-money* is collected; but nothing is there said of any census being taken. On the other hand, in Numb. i. 1—46, more than six months after the date of the former occasion, we have an account of a very formal numbering of the people, the result being given of each particular tribe, and the total number made up at the end. Here the *census* is made, but there is no indication of any atonement-money being paid."

Thus D. C. finds two contradictions in the text, Exod. xxx. 11—13. The first is, that the half-shekel should be paid without a numbering. But here, even on D. C.'s supposition that there was no numbering, it does not follow that there is a contradiction. The command, Exod. xxx. 11—13, does not say that the Israelites never were to contribute the half-shekel to the service

of God, except when they were numbered; but, that when they were numbered, they were to pay the half-shekel. A contribution, therefore, to this amount, might, so far as this text is concerned, be offered at any time without a numbering. But D. C.'s supposition is not correct. When the half-shekel was paid there was a numbering[1]. In the very words which he himself quotes from Exod. xxxviii., the numbering is mentioned, "A bekah for every man that went to be numbered." If they went to be numbered, how can it be said that there was no numbering? Besides, in verse 21, the name of the numberer, Ithamar, and Moses' command to number, are both given. But here again D. C. has omitted these important words of the 26th verse, "Every one that went to be numbered from twenty years old and upward, for 603,550 men." These words prove beyond all doubt that a numbering must have taken place. How, else, could "the sum total" be given? Why did D. C. suppress these words here? for in this case we have proof that he was well aware of their existence, as he uses them as the ground of another objection, when he says, "It is surprising that the number of the male adults should have been *identically the same* (603,550) on the first occasion *as it was half a year afterwards;*" and again,

[1] D. C. says *Census*. But the Hebrew word is the same in Exod. xxxviii. and Numbers i. and ii.

p. 49, where he says, "In fact, the amount is checked, as it were, and verified in the case of the silver, by the same statement being repeated in Exod. xxxviii. in three different forms. In ver. 25 the sum of the silver paid is reckoned by talents. In ver. 26, the number of men is given by whom it was paid, &c." Here, then, D. C. admits that the men were numbered. Why, then, did he omit the words stating this fact when he wished to make out a contradiction?

With regard to the second numbering, D. C. himself admits that silence with regard to the payment of the atonement-money might be accidental. If so, why make this silence an objection? A little more attention to the whole narrative would have taught him that there is not the least semblance of variance in the two accounts. In the first place, the two narratives, Exod. xxxviii. and Numb. i. ii., as is admitted by sceptical critics, were written by the same author[2]; and as he was at least an intelligent man, as appears from his arithmetic, and triple mode of checking the sum total of the half-shekels, we can hardly suppose that he contradicted himself. In the next place, the two numberings together make only one fulfilment of the command given by Moses, Exod. xxx. 11—16. In verses 11—15 the Lord commands, that when

[2] See Knobel, in loc.

Moses takes the sum of the children of Israel, each should give a half-shekel, without defining whether it should be paid before or after the numbering of the persons. In ver. 16, He tells what is to be done with the silver thus collected. It is to be devoted to the service of the Tabernacle, i. e., as we find from chapter xxxviii. 27, 28, to the making of the silver sockets. It was necessary, therefore, first to take the atonement-money. Every man of the proper age came and paid his half-shekel, and by counting the sum the number of the people was also taken. This counting was done by Ithamar, by Moses' command, Exod. xxxviii. 21; and the sum of the half-shekels, and therefore of the men, found to be 603,550. But the numbering of the *persons* by Moses and his assistants was deferred until the erection of the Tabernacle, as described Numb. i., when the number was found to be the same. To facilitate the construction of the Tabernacle, the atonement-money had been paid in advance. Afterwards the formal numbering took place—and thus the two numberings, first of the half-shekel, and then of the persons, make together one fulfilment of the command, and what appears to be a difficulty becomes a proof of the honesty and trustworthiness of the historian. That the numbers should be the same in both cases is not very surprising. They were numbered who had already paid their atonement-

money. The command in Numb. l. 2, 3, must be taken in connexion with the original command, Exod. xxx., and the preparatory contribution of the half-shekels.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. VIII. *The Israelites dwelling in Tents.*

In his eighth chapter, Bishop Colenso sets forth his difficulty about the Israelites dwelling in tents: "Take ye every man for them which are in his tents," Exod. xvi. 16. This statement of their having tents and dwelling in them, "conflicts strangely," he says, "with that in Lev. xxiii. 42, 43, where it is assigned as a reason for their 'dwelling in booths,' for seven days, at the feast of tabernacles, 'that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in *booths* when I brought them out of the land of Egypt.'" Now supposing for a moment that the word "booth" cannot mean "tent," there is no necessary contradiction between the two statements, that the Israelites dwelt in booths, and also dwelt in tents. Some, the poor for instance, i. e. the great body of the nation, may have dwelt in the former. The more wealthy may have had the latter. And even of the middle class, between these two, many may, under the circumstances of the case, have been very glad of booths to shelter themselves and

their families. The very mention of booths as well as tents is a proof of the historical truth of the narrative. If tents alone had been spoken of, D. C.'s objection, drawn from the impossibility of having 200,000 tents, might have had some plausibility. But the mention of the booths easily solves the difficulty. Those who could have tents used them, and those who could not had booths of whatever materials they found. Even as to those who had tents, we can hardly suppose that they had all been made by the best manufacturers of the day, but that at first, certainly, they were very make-shift concerns. In every case the booths of the poor would be, of course, more numerous than the tents of the rich, and so it would be natural to call the feast "The feast of booths, or tabernacles," rather than the "Feast of tents;" though, when we have considered the true meaning of *Succah*, *booth*, we shall see the true reason of this title. Here again D. C. is inaccurate and incomplete in his statement. He says, "The Hebrew word for a *booth*, made of boughs and bushes, סֻכָּה, which is the word here used, is quite different from that for a *tent*, אֹהֶל, used in xvi. 16." And that when it is in "2 Sam. xi. 11, and one or two other places," it is used of tents, "it is used improperly." D. C. seems to believe that a *booth* (Succah) must necessarily be made of boughs and bushes; but this belief is contradicted both

by the etymology and the usage of the word. It is derived from Sakakh, "to cover, protect, &c.;" and *Succah*, booth, signifies in its primary sense, "a space covered over, or a covert." It may be a lair for wild beasts, Ps. x. 9: "He lieth in wait in the hiding-place, as a lion in his lair" (Succoh); or temporary booths for cattle, Gen. xxxiii. 17; or a shed in a garden, Isaiah i.; or rude tents for soldiers, 2 Sam. xi. 11; or the most magnificent tents of kings, as of Benhadad, 1 Kings xx. 12—16, translated *pavilions* in our English version; or of King David, Amos ix. 11, "The tabernacle of David;" or the sacred Tabernacle of God (Succo), Ps. xviii. 12; 2 Sam. xxii. 12; Ps. xxvii. 5; and lxxvi. 3. Compare also Job xxxvi. 29, "His tabernacle," just as the cognate word *Siccuth* is used of the tabernacle of the idol which the children of Israel carried in the wilderness. Does D. C. mean that the lair of the lion, or the pavilion of Benhadad, or the tabernacle of David, or the Tabernacle of God, was made "of boughs and bushes," or does he presume to call the author of the Book of Kings, or David, or Amos to task, and say they use the word *Succah* "improperly?" It is to be presumed that D. C. overlooked, and did not suppress, this meaning of *Succah*. The truth is, when *Succah* is applied to the pavilion of Benhadad, or the tabernacle of David, or the Lord's dwelling-place, it cannot be translated "booth,"

and cannot have been constructed "of boughs and bushes." In these cases it means *tent*, just as much as *Ohel*. The etymology and the usage show that *Succah* expresses the *genus*, of which *booth* and *tent* are only *species;* and the great festival is called "the feast of *Succoth*," tabernacles, and could not be called the feast of *Ohalim*, *tents*, for then the booths of the poor would be excluded, and it would seem as if Israel in the wilderness had dwelt in tents, and tents only; and D. C. might with some plausibility have asked whence they got them all. The feast of *Succoth*, tabernacles, embraces both the *tents* of the rich and the *booths* of the poor. Some dwelt in one, some in the other, all doubtless in whatever they could procure; and thus D. C. has thrown away much arithmetic, which might have been prevented if he had inquired into the meaning of words before he invoked the aid of figures.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. IX. *The Israelites armed.*

The next objection (chap. ix.) is derived from Exod. xiii. 18. "The children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt;" upon which D. C. observes, that "the word חֲמֻשִׁים, which is here rendered 'harnessed,' appears to mean

'armed' or in 'battle-array,' in all other passages where it occurs. . . . . It is, however, inconceivable that these trodden-down oppressed people should have been allowed by Pharaoh to possess arms, so as to turn out at a moment's notice six hundred thousand armed men."

Now, first suppose that the Hebrew word means "armed," as our translators doubtless intended to say, when they translated it "harnessed[3]." The arming must have been very imperfect, and utterly insufficient to qualify them for conflict with the warlike Philistines. The warriors of Egypt were, as D. C. reminds us, a distinct caste, from which of course the Israelites were excluded. If some were adequately armed, the multitude would only have such weapons as their callings supplied, or they could lay hold of in their haste. But, in the next place, the words "The children of Israel went up armed," do not necessarily mean that all were armed. In Joshua iv. 12 it is said, "The children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and half of the tribe of Manasseh, passed over armed before the children of Israel." But this does not mean that all the men of those tribes passed over armed, but only forty thousand, as is explained in the following verse. And yet, that all the six hundred thousand were armed is absolutely

[3] Compare 1 Kings xx. 11, and xxii. 34; also Shakespeare's "We'll die with harness on."

necessary to give any plausibility to D. C.'s objection. Therefore, he says, p. 51, "We must suppose that the whole body of the six hundred thousand warriors were armed, when they were numbered, Numb. i. 3, under Sinai. They possessed arms, surely, at that time, according to the story." And yet, D. C.'s language all through betokens uncertainty. First, he says, that the Hebrew word "appears to mean armed." Then he says, "we must suppose." Then, "they possessed arms, *surely*, at that time." If this be certain, why does D. C. not prove it? Why does he say, "we must suppose?" There is nothing in the narrative to suggest any such idea. D. C. speaks of six hundred thousand warriors. But the word "warriors" is inserted by himself, and is a pure invention of his own, without any warrant in the text. In the whole Pentateuch there is not one passage which implies that the six hundred thousand numbered were warriors. They are not called "men of war," nor "mighty men of valour," nor "they that draw the sword," the Hebrew expressions for warriors. Numb. i. 3 speaks only of those who were *liable* to be called upon to do military duty, and thus our English version translates, "From twenty years old and upwards, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel," or rather to military service[4].

[4] There is a difference between צבא, which properly signifies *host*, and מלחמה, which signifies *war* or *battle*, as

But all who are able to go forth to military service are not necessarily warriors or armed: even amongst the three most military nations of modern Europe, this is far from being the case. In the Statistical Companion, published 1848, I find the population of France given at 35,400,048. Of these, the number of men capable of bearing arms would be, if calculated in the same proportion as the 600,000 to the two millions of Israelites, one-third, or in round numbers, 12,000,000, and yet the army on its war establishment is given only as 800,000, or one-fifteenth of that number. The population of Prussia was at that time 16,112,948: those capable of bearing arms would therefore be above five millions, and yet the war-army was only 550,000 men, about one-tenth. Russia had then 62,507,700, the third of which, that is, the men capable of bearing arms, would be more than twenty millions; and yet the war-army was only 870,000, not one-twentieth of the men liable to the military service. If Israel had 600,000 men capable of bearing arms, and if we take the mean between the tenth and the twentieth, that is, the fifteenth, for the actual army, then the real number

may be seen by their being construed together, Numb. xxxi. 14, and Isa. xiii. 4. The expression, "who go forth to the host, or to service," is used of the Levites, Numb. iv. 3. 30. 35. 39, and yet they were not a portion of the 600,000, nor were they "Warriors."

of those under arms would be only 40,000; and, curious to say, that is just the number given Josh. iv. 13, of those who passed over before their brethren to fight with the Canaanites and take possession of the promised land. At the numbering under Sinai, the number of adults actually armed was probably still less. But, whatever their number, the words of the Mosaic narrative nowhere imply that the 600,000 men liable to military service were all armed. It is nowhere said, that they were "men of war," or, that "they drew the sword."

But, in the next place, D. C. knows that the meaning of the Hebrew word *Chamushim* (חמשים) is one of the most disputed points in sacred philology. He, himself, mentions the opinions of the LXX, Clericus, Fuller, Gesenius, and might have enumerated scores of others; and does not assert, much less does he attempt to prove, that the sense "armed" is the only true and certain meaning. He says, "The word חמשים *appears* to mean 'armed;'" and on this appearance, this vraisemblance to his own mind, he asks us not only to give up the opinions of better Hebrew scholars than he has yet proved himself, but to renounce our faith in the historic character of the Mosaic narrative. He must have formed no small estimate of the weight of, not his conviction, but his opinion, when he

calls upon the Church of England, on such grounds, to abandon its ancient faith.

But the meaning "armed" is not only doubtful, it is improbable; first, because it does not suit the context of Exod. xiii. 18, the first place where it occurs. In verses 17, 18, we are told, "that God led them not the way of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent, when they see war, and they return to Egypt. But God led them about the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea. And the children of Israel went up 'armed' out of the land of Egypt." This is a strange conclusion to what goes before. If they were armed, that was just a reason why they might be led the way of the Philistines, and should not repent at seeing war. One would rather expect here, "And the children of Israel went up unarmed." The translation "*armed*" does not at all agree with what goes before, and is therefore probably incorrect. Its suiting the three other places where the word occurs, cannot outweigh the fact that it does not suit here. The testimony of the ancient versions is here of no value, as the word does not occur at all after the Book of Judges, and had therefore become obsolete long before the time of the earliest of them, the LXX. Their translation is a mere conjecture. There was no certain

tradition as to the meaning of the word, as is proved by the disagreement of the Rabbis: and, secondly, which is fatal to the meaning "armed," there is no trace of a verb *Chamash*, חָמַשׁ, or of any cognate verb, signifying "to arm," either in Hebrew, or any of the cognate dialects. The word, whether Chamushshim, חֲמֻשִּׁים, according to the common reading, or Chamushim, חֲמֻשִׁים, according to the Spanish manuscripts, must be derived from a verb *Chamash*, חָמַשׁ. If the derived word signify "armed," then the verb must signify "to arm." But no such verb exists, nor any thing like it, in Hebrew or any other Semitic language. Then "arm" cannot be the meaning. Moved especially by the last consideration, Gesenius and Knobel have sought for a meaning which will not only suit all the places where the word occurs, but also admit of a Semitic etymology. Gesenius gives, "*acres, strenui, alacres ad pugnandum*," or, as it is in Robinson's translation, "fierce, active, eager, brave in battle." Knobel[5] prefers "marshalled in order, in companies, as distinguished from disorderly, straggling." Both reject the sense "armed." The two great Jewish authorities, Onkelos and Aben Ezra, explain the word to mean "girt," i. e. the long garments girt up, which will apply either to travelling or to war.

[5] Comment, in loc.

The greatest authorities, therefore, Jewish and Gentile, reject that sense on which D. C.'s difficulty entirely depends.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. X. *The Institution of the Passover.*

D. C. finds great difficulties with regard to the institution and first celebration of the Passover. He thinks it impossible "that in one single day the whole immense population of Israel, as large as that of London, was instructed to keep the Passover, and actually kept it;" first, because it was impossible "to convey the command, with its minute particulars, to each individual household in one day—or rather *in twelve hours*, since Moses received the command on the very same day on which they were to kill the Passover at even, Exod. xii. 6." "Having so large flocks and herds, 'even very much cattle,' Exod. xii. 38, many of them must have lived scattered over the large extent of grazing ground required under their circumstances," occupying, according to D. C.'s calculation, a space of at least thirty-five square miles. Now supposing, for the sake of argument, that D. C.'s assumptions are true; that the command was given and the Passover celebrated on one and the same day, and admitting that Israel was scattered all through Goshen, and that Goshen was equal to

not merely thirty-five but to sixty square miles, there would be no impossibility of transmitting the message to them. Their descendants in Poland are said to have had a method of transmitting important information through a much larger extent of country than Goshen, in a very few hours. They mounted a man with the message on a good horse; he galloped off to the next congregation and delivered his message to the Rabbi. The Rabbi immediately sent off a fresh messenger on a fresh horse; and so on, until, in a very few hours, the news was communicated to all the Rabbis. Each on the receipt of the intelligence assembled his own congregation in the Synagogue, and made known to them the tidings received; and thus money was raised, and petitions adopted and despatched to the right quarters often before the dreaded decree had left the Government office. In like manner, if D. C.'s supposition about "the same day" were true, the Israelites in Goshen might be informed in time. Suppose that some of the scattered Israelites were fifty miles distant from Moses, messengers thus despatched could with ease arrive in five hours. Those nearer would receive the directions in less time. If the command was given to Moses at five in the morning, and an hour elapsed before Moses and the Elders could send off the messengers, the most distant could still receive the command by eleven o'clock

in the forenoon, which would leave ample time to make the necessary preparation. But why should we limit the time to twelve hours? The Lord might have commanded Moses at the beginning of the fourteenth day; that is, as the Hebrews began their day at evening, at least twenty hours before the Passover was to be killed. The most distant might therefore be informed twelve or fifteen hours before the time, and might prepare and keep the Passover. Even every individual male might be informed; for we doubt not that the whole nation was on the alert, and had for weeks been waiting for the signal to go forth. The first message, Exod. iii. 7, 8, was, that God saw their affliction and would deliver them, and bring them into the promised land. Each successive plague would increase their attention, and keep all the dispersions of Israel in continued excitement, waiting for the order to move. The communication of the command was, therefore, not impossible, even on D. C.'s hypothesis, but comparatively easy.

But then, says D. C., it was impossible that they could have the necessary number of lambs —that would require a flock of two millions of sheep, and that again would require four hundred thousand acres of pasturage. But, if modern writers be correct as to the situation and extent of Goshen, stretching from the Pelusiac branch of the Nile along the Mediterranean to the

borders of Palestine one way, and to the Desert and the Red Sea on the other, there must have been much more than four hundred thousand acres of pasturage; so that on this score there is no difficulty. Besides, D. C.'s calculation of the two hundred thousand lambs required for the Passover, is made on the supposition that there were only ten persons to each lamb. But why, if lambs were scarce, might not fifty or even one hundred persons have joined to partake of one lamb? There is nothing in the Law to forbid it. D. C. says that "Josephus (de Bell. Jud. vi. 9. 3) reckons ten persons on an average for each lamb." But if D. C. will look again, he will see that Josephus does not make *ten* the average; but says there were never less than ten men, οὐκ ἔλασσον ἀνδρῶν δέκα. The Rabbinic law did not allow less than *ten*, because that number is, according to tradition, necessary to make a congregation (Minian). But there is no limit the other way, except the size of the lamb. According to the Mishna, the law was satisfied by each person eating a morsel of the size of an olive. Now, a lamb of one year old could easily be cut into fifty or one hundred such pieces. If companies of ten required two hundred thousand lambs, companies of fifty would require only forty thousand, and companies of one hundred only twenty thousand.

But in D. C.'s calculation there is another false assumption; and that is, that lambs in our

sense of the word, the offspring of sheep, are required, whereas the Hebrew *Seh* (שה), translated *lamb*, means not only the young of a sheep, but includes also a kid of the goats. Kids, therefore, were as lawful for the Passover as lambs; and Oriental flocks have always a large admixture of goats, as they do not require such good pasturage, "and the goat is more easily fed than any other animal of its size." In the present which Jacob sent to Esau, the proportion of sheep and goats is the same. "Two hundred she goats and twenty he goats, two hundred ewes and twenty rams," Gen. xxxii. 14. If, therefore, the Israelites had not lambs enough, they could take kids; and, if both failed, we learn from Deut. xvi. 2, that even oxen might be used: "Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, *from the flock* or *from the herd*." From 2 Chron. xxx. 24, and xxxv. 7, it appears that in the Passovers of Hezekiah and Josiah bullocks were actually employed as well as lambs and kids.

Thus all D. C.'s calculations about the number of acres necessary to keep so many sheep, and so many sheep necessary to produce so many lambs, are arithmetic thrown away. A less hasty study of the Bible might have helped him to arrive at different conclusions. It would certainly have saved him from making difficulties where none exist.

Of a similar nature is the difficulty derived

from the Israelites borrowing from the Egyptians. They "hastened at a moment's notice to borrow in all directions from the Egyptians;" . . . . and we have "to imagine the time that would be required for the poorer half of London going hurriedly to borrow from the richer half, in addition to their other anxieties, in starting upon such a sudden and momentous expedition." Here again the impetuousness of D. C.'s zeal has betrayed him into an error not to be expected from an intelligent student. The command to borrow, or rather to demand, and the willingness of the Egyptians to give, are related in Chap. xi., before the announcement to Pharaoh of the coming death of the firstborn, and before the celebration of the Passover. How long before does not appear, but probably before even the choice of a lamb on the tenth day. Most of the supposed difficulties in this chapter arise from one grave and fundamental error. D. C. assumes that the command to keep the Passover was not given to Israel until the same day that the Passover was to be kept. Thus he says, on p. 54, "In one single day, the whole immense population of Israel, as large as that of London, was to keep the Passover, and actually did keep it. I have said 'in one single day;' for the first notice of any such feast to be kept is given in this very chapter, where we find it written, verse 12, 'I will pass through the land

of Egypt *this night*, and will smite all the first born in the land of Egypt.'" He attempts to strengthen his position, by remarking on the difference between two Hebrew pronouns. "The expression in verse 12 is distinctly הַזֶּה, 'this,' not הַהוּא, 'that,' as in xiii. 8." Now, as a general rule, this is all very well, and necessary to be observed by beginners in Hebrew; but owing to the peculiarity of the Hebrew style in narrative, it does not always hold good. Thus in Lev. xvi. 30, the English version has, "For on *that* day shall the Priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you." The English idiom here required 'that;' as if the Hebrew had *Hahu*, הַהוּא. But in Hebrew it is, "For on this day (*Hazzeh*, הַזֶּה) shall the Priest make an atonement," and yet the reference is not to the day on which the Lord was speaking, but to that of which He had been speaking, and concerning which He had been giving directions in the whole of the chapter. In like manner here, Exod. xii. 12, "this night" does not refer to the day in which the Lord was speaking to Moses, but to that day concerning which He had been giving His commands, in the preceding verses [6]. Compare also ver. 8 with ver. 6 in the original.

[6] For a similar use of זה, see Gen. vii. 11. "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, *in this day*, ביום הזה, were all the fountains of the great deep broken up." Here "in this

Indeed, in this very chapter there is another similar use of *Zeh*, זה, not perceivable in the English version, which has "It came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day, it came to pass." But in the Hebrew it is "In *this* selfsame day, ביום הזה, it came to pass," where it is plain that the historian is not speaking of the then present day in which he was writing, but of *that* day which formed the subject of the whole chapter. D. C.'s Hebrew criticism is therefore of no value, as it proceeds simply from inadequate acquaintance with Hebrew idiom, and the difficulty based on it, of course, falls to the ground.

But even without any Hebrew at all, the attentive reader of this chapter in the English version will see that D. C. is wrong. The direction to choose the lamb on the tenth day necessarily presupposes that it was given before the tenth day, and therefore D. C. himself says, "It is true that the story as it now stands, with the directions about 'taking the lamb on the tenth day,' and

day" does not mean the day on which Moses was writing, but *that* day long past, the end of the seven days of which he had spoken in the preceding chapter. Again, in Josh. v. 11, "And they did eat of the old corn of the land on the morrow after the passover . . . . *in this* selfsame day (בעצם היום הזה)," where, again, "this" does not refer to the then present day in which he was writing, but to that which was past.

'keeping it until the fourteenth,' are perplexing and contradictory," that is, they annihilate his whole theory and objections. But to them who read the whole chapter quietly over there is nothing perplexing or contradictory. They find, first of all, in verse 3, "Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month, they shall take to them every man a lamb [margin, 'or kid'], according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for a house." Then, verse 6, "And ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day of *this* month[7], and the whole congregation of the children of Israel shall kill it in the evening [margin, 'between the two evenings'] . . . . for (verse 12) I will pass through the land this night, and will smite all the firstborn in Egypt. . . . *This* day (verse 14) shall be unto you for a memorial . . . . for in *this* selfsame day (verse 17) have I brought out your armies out of the land of Egypt." The reader perceives that the Lord begins to speak some time before the tenth day of the month, and commands the choosing of a lamb or kid on that day. Then He tells them to keep it until the fourteenth day. Then He says, "for I shall in this night pass through the land of Egypt," evidently referring to the night of the day mentioned verse 6, and not to the night of the day in which

[7] Not "of the same month," as in the E. V.

He was speaking. Then He adds "*This day*," that is, the fourteenth of which I have been speaking, "shall be unto you for a memorial, because on *this* day I have brought out your armies." When the Lord spoke, He had not brought them out, and yet He speaks of it as past, referring still to that day concerning which He had given His commands. The plain English is therefore sufficient to show that D. C.'s assumption, that the command was given and the Passover celebrated on one and the same day, is totally without foundation. The command was given at least one day before the tenth, probably more, even at the beginning of the month, as the chapter opens with the words, "This month shall be unto you the beginning of months," which words could not have been spoken later than the first day. This will be abundantly confirmed in the answer to the next objection.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XI. *The March out of Egypt.*

D. C. takes Exod. xii. 37, 38, as his text: "And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and the flocks, and herds, even very much cattle." "Here then," he says, "we have this vast body of people

summoned to start, according to the story, at a moment's notice, not one being left behind, together with all their multitudinous flocks and herds, which must have been spread out over a district as large as a good-sized English county . . . . we are required to believe that, in one single day, the order to depart was communicated suddenly, at midnight . . . . that in obedience to such order, having first 'borrowed' very largely of their neighbours in all directions, they then came in from all parts of the land of Goshen to Rameses, bringing with them the sick and infirm, the young and the aged; further, that since receiving the summons, they had sent to gather in all their flocks and herds, spread over so wide a district, and had driven them also to Rameses; and, lastly, that having done all this, since they were roused at midnight, they were started again from Rameses that very same day, and marched on to Succoth, not leaving a single sick or infirm person, a single woman in child-birth, or even 'a single hoof,' Exod. x. 26, behind them."

It has already been proved that they were not summoned at a moment's notice, nor suddenly at midnight, but at least five or six, probably thirteen days before, and had known of their intended journey for some weeks. We have also seen that the borrowing took place long before. The Israelites knew also that after the death of the firstborn Pharaoh would let them go, for Moses

would not keep this a secret from the people. The very ordinance of the Passover implied that they were to be ready to move soon after they had eaten it; for the command was to eat it "with their loins girded, with their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand, and they were to eat it in haste," i. e. they were to be ready soon after to depart. Indeed, they knew the very hour that was to be the signal of their departure. The Lord had informed them that at midnight He would pass through the land of Egypt, and that then Pharaoh and the Egyptians would eagerly press upon them to go—and this they knew probably thirteen days before. There was ample time, therefore, to make provision for the infirm, the young, and the aged, and to gather the cattle, especially as the Israelites were aware for weeks before that they were about to leave Egypt, and to take their cattle with them; and, as has been said above, must have lived from day to day in expectation of setting out, and must have been getting things ready for the move. No doubt, with all this previous knowledge and preparation, they were hurried at last, as any one knows who has moved from his residence of many years to a foreign country, or even to another house in his own land. There was, doubtless, much haste and much confusion, when the Egyptians urged them to depart. But it is absolutely false that this multitude was sum-

moned to start at a moment's notice, or that the order was communicated suddenly at midnight, a pure fiction of D. C.'s imagination, which is negatived by the whole narrative, and the express words of the command how to observe the Passover.

Similar is the assertion that they all first assembled at Rameses with their flocks and herds. The text simply says, "The children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth." It is not said, "all the children of Israel," or "all the congregation of the children of Israel." Rameses was, no doubt, the head-quarters of Moses and Aaron, and there perhaps was the greatest body of the people assembled in any one place. As Moses and Aaron, and the elders, and a great body of people started from that city, the narrative says, with truth, "The children of Israel journeyed from Rameses." But to suppose that those Israelites who lived or fed their flocks on the road to Succoth turned back to Rameses, is incredible, and nothing but the desire to magnify a difficulty, where it does not exist, could have induced D. C. thus to pervert the simple words. Moses was not a man devoid of understanding. Even if not inspired, he had for many years contemplated the enterprise, knew well the abodes of the people whom he wished to deliver, must have guided the whole, and have been in constant communication with all portions of the

people. Even as an uninspired man, he must have had a plan, and a route, and must have instructed the dispersed of Israel accordingly.

But D. C. has now his difficulties respecting the march. He says, "If they marched fifty abreast, the able-bodied warriors alone would have filled up the road for about twenty-two miles." But if they did not, we reply, what then? Why, then they would not have filled up the road for twenty-two miles. We are not told one word as to the order which they observed, and therefore speculation is vain. They came from different places of Goshen, and were not likely all to follow in the same track; and this partly solves the difficulty about the cattle. They would, he says, 'lengthen out the train for many long miles. And such grass as there was, if not eaten down by the first ranks, must have been trodden under foot at once and destroyed by those that followed them mile after mile. What then did these two millions of sheep and oxen live upon during this journey from Rameses to Succoth, and from Succoth to Etham, and from Etham to the Red Sea?" Now, in the first place, the Pentateuch nowhere says that there were two millions of sheep and oxen; and we have shown that D. C.'s calculation from the Paschal lambs is based on false data, and therefore worthless. That they had a great many we doubt not. But as we have said, there is no authority whatever for supposing

that they all took the same route; and as to the question, What did they live upon? we reply, first, upon whatever they could find[8]; and, secondly, upon what their owners had provided, and had been providing ever since they were told that they and their cattle were to go into the wilderness on their road to Canaan. These owners lived adjoining the desert, probably pastured their flocks in various places through which they were now to pass, were acquainted with desert life, were therefore aware of the difficulties to be encountered, and as they were not a nation of fools, must have taken the necessary precautions. D. C.'s fundamental error is in supposing that the Israelites suddenly went out at midnight without forethought or preparation, a supposition diametrically opposed to the plain words of the narrative.

BISHOP COLENSO, CHAP. XII. *The Sheep and Cattle in the Desert.*

"And the children of Israel did eat manna for forty years, until they came to a land inhabited: they did eat manna until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan," Exod. xvi. 35. "The *people*, we are told, were supplied with manna; but there was no miraculous provision

[8] Burckhardt tells us that the desert of Suez "is full of rich pasture and pools of water during winter and spring." Travels, p. 462.

of food for the herds and flocks. They were left to gather sustenance as they could, in that inhospitable wilderness." But, according to the accounts of modern travellers quoted by him, "the desert is utterly barren, especially the peninsula of Sinai, where the Israelites were for a year, but where two millions of people and cattle could not now be sustained for a fortnight." We reply, in the first place, according to the opinion of Ewald, that the wilderness in general and the peninsula of Sinai must have been different then from what they are now. After stating his belief that the numbers, 603,550 and others, are historic and taken from ancient census-rolls, Ewald goes on to say: "We cannot overlook the fact that the peninsula could at that time support more human beings than at present; under great privations, it is true, concerning which, according to all the reminiscences, there were so many complainings, but so that an abstemious and industrious people need not perish. From the present number of inhabitants, in a land long deprived of human labour, it is not safe to draw a conclusion as to its former condition. That peninsula is not the only region, from whose present small population its former multitude of inhabitants could never be conjectured. The most different causes, as invading sloth and barbarism, (and these are undeniably found there,) advance of the sand driven forward by the wind, change of the temperature of the soil, may all contribute to the desolation of

a land. Which of these causes has worked here, has not been sufficiently investigated in modern times. So much, however, is now clear, that this region, though far from being explored in all directions by competent Europeans, is by no means one great sandy level, but has, exclusive of Sinai, a number of hills and mountains. Besides, we cannot know accurately, how far from Kadesh the several tribes may have extended their excursions in order to find food. Kadesh was clearly the resting-place only for Moses and the Ark, and the place of gathering for the congregations on certain days[9]."

That the peninsula of Sinai and the neighbouring desert may have changed, is not improbable. The Haurân, the Libyan nome, the Roman province of Africa, are very different from what they once were. The neighbourhood of Palmyra, once remarkable for its rich soil and pleasant streams, is sadly changed. "The heap of sand, which has now drifted to a considerable depth over all these ruins, surely manifests that some change must have taken place in the surface of the country since Palmyra stood here, as the founders of the city would never have erected its handsome buildings and majestic porticos on a site exposed to drifting sands, the clearing away of which would be, from the present aspect of the plain, a ceaseless toil[10]." A similar change

[9] Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 201, 202.
[10] Addison's Damascus and Palmyra, p. 321.

may have taken place with portions of the desert in which the Israelites sojourned so long. Parts of it were and are "a great and terrible wilderness," "a howling wilderness," and to this Bishop Colenso has adduced sufficient testimony. But this does not apply to the whole. In the days of Moses the Amalekites and Midianites pastured in it their numerous flocks and herds. And even in its present lonely and deserted state, modern travellers continually speak of fertile spots and good pasturage[1]. Burckhardt, who saw much more of the peninsula of Sinai than most recent visitors, thus speaks of the El Tyh ridge of mountains: "These chains form the northern boundaries of the Sinai mountains, and *are the pasturing-places of the Sinai Bedouins.* They are the most regular ranges of the peninsula, being almost throughout of equal height, without any prominent peaks, and extending in an uninterrupted line eastwards. They are inhabited by the Terabein and Tyaha, the latter of whom *are richer in camels and flocks* than any other of the Towara tribes. . . . . At the southern foot of the mountain Tyh extends a broad sandy plain, called El Seyh, which begins at the Debbe, and continues for two days' journey eastwards. It affords good pasturage in

[1] As Dr. Stanley's remarks on this subject have been cited by Bishop Colenso, I have given some extracts from Burckhardt, to whom German writers so frequently refer.

spring, but has no water, and is therefore little frequented by the Bedouins[2]." Again, p. 483: "From the top of Djebel Leboua we descended a little, and entered the Wady Genne, a fine valley *several miles in breadth, and covered with pasturage.* . . . . I was told that very good water is found at about two miles to the east of this valley." And again, p. 487: "The Wady el Sheik is broad, and has a very slight acclivity: it is much frequented by Bedouins for its pasturage. Whenever rain falls in the mountains, a stream of water flows through this Wady, and from thence through Wady Feiran into the sea." "Wady Feiran is a continuation of Wady el Sheik, and is considered the finest valley in the whole peninsula. From the upper extremity, where we alighted, an uninterrupted row of gardens and date plantations extends downwards for four miles. In almost every garden is a well, by means of which the grounds are irrigated the whole year round. . . . . The owners seldom visit the place, except in the date harvest, when the valley is filled with people for a month or six weeks: at that season they erect huts of palm branches, and pass their time in conviviality." And again, p. 490: "In the western mountain opposite Sheik Szaleh, and about one hour and a half distant, is *a fruitful pasturing-place upon a*

[2] Travels in Syria and the Holy Land, p. 481.

high mountain, with many fields and plantations of trees." Although these testimonies are sufficient, we cannot forbear adding one more, out of many similar. Speaking of the Wady Kyd, he says (p. 535): "The windings of the valley led us, at the end of five hours and a half, to a small rivulet, two feet across, and six inches in depth, which is lost immediately below in the sands of the Wady. It drips down a granite rock, which blocks up the valley, there only twenty paces in breadth, and forms at the foot of the rock a small pond, overshadowed by trees, with fine verdure on its banks. . . . . Beyond it we continued in the same narrow valley, along the rivulet, amidst groves of date, Nebek, and some tamarisk trees, until, at six hours, we reached the source of the rivulet. . . . . This is one of the most noted valleys of the Sinai Arabs: the contrast of its deep verdure with the glaring rocks by which it is closely hemmed in, is very striking, and shows that wherever water passes in these districts, however barren the ground, vegetation is invariably found[3]." These testimonies have led Mr. Leake, the editor, to observe that, "The upper region of Sinai, which forms an irregular circle of thirty or forty miles in diameter, possessing numerous sources of water, a temperate climate, and a soil capable of sup-

[3] See also the account of the excellent pasturage of the Djebel Katerin, p. 570, &c. &c.

porting animal and vegetable nature, was the part of the peninsula best adapted to the residence of near a year, during which the Israelites were numbered and received their laws[4]."

In the days of Moses there may have been still more of these green spots in "the terrible wilderness," which in course of time have been destroyed. Burckhardt tells us of the Wady Ahmeer, that fifty years before his visit, "it was one of the most fertile valleys of the country, full of date and other fruit trees; but that a violent flood tore up all the trees, and laid it waste in a few days, and since that period it has been deserted." Similar catastrophes may have occurred elsewhere. It is certain that the Bedouins themselves have committed much havoc, by cutting down the trees, and burning them into charcoal, not only for their own use, but for the Cairo market[5].

With these accounts of Burckhardt the narrative of the Pentateuch and other places of Scripture agree. The very choice of Sinai as the place to which the Israelites were to be brought, and where they were to abide for some time, implies that it must have been the most suitable. Even if they had not been under Divine guidance, Moses, after forty years' experience, must

[4] Preface to Burckhardt's Travels, p. xiii.

[5] Compare also what Seetzen says of the desolation of Pharaun, vol. iii. pp. 17 and 45.

have had an extensive and accurate acquaintance with the desert, and if he had led his father-in-law's flocks to Sinai (Exod. iii. 1), it must have been because the pasturage was abundant. Indeed, the Hebrew word *Midbar*, as D. C. himself notices, does not mean an entirely desolate desert, but a wilderness, a place whither cattle were driven for pasturage. Now, though the word will not prove that the whole furnished pasturage, yet some parts of it must have been suitable, and commonly used for the purpose, else it could never have acquired the name "Midbar." In other Scriptures the pastures of the desert are also alluded to. Thus Jeremiah, ix. 10 (9), says, "For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing, and for the pastures[6] of the wilderness a lamentation." And again, xxiii. 10, "The pastures[6] of the wilderness are dried up." So Joel (i. 19) exclaims, "O Lord, to Thee will I cry: for the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness;" and ii. 22, "Be not afraid, ye beasts of the field, for the pastures of the wilderness do spring." It is true that these pasture places were the exception, and therefore the Israelites often complain, and must have lost much cattle, as, on leaving the wilderness, the two and a half tribes alone are mentioned as having flocks and herds in abundance. But after the first

[6] In both these places the Hebrew word is נאות, *pastures.*

troubles and inconvenience, the very number of the Israelites and of their cattle would furnish the means of improving and cultivating every available spot in the desert, and furnish hands for the work; for we are not to suppose that the Israelites, accustomed to shepherd life and hard work, folded their arms and did nothing.

These considerations are independent of immediate Divine interposition. But might it not be inferred, from God's gracious and miraculous care of the people, that He did not leave their cattle to perish? D. C. says, that there are only three interpositions as to water recorded in the Pentateuch. But elsewhere they are mentioned, as in Ps. lxv. 11, 12: "Thy paths drop fatness. They drop upon the pastures of the wilderness, and the little hills rejoice on every side. The pastures are clothed with flocks." In Ps. lxviii. 7, the wanderings in the wilderness and the Lord's mercy are distinctly mentioned: "O God, when Thou wentest forth before Thy people, when Thou didst march through the wilderness, the earth shook, the heavens dropped [rain] at the presence of the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby Thou didst confirm Thine inheritance, when it was weary." And in the Song of Deborah, acknowledged even by sceptical critics to be genuine, we read, "Lord, when Thou wentest out of Seir,

when Thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water. The mountains melted [or flowed] from before the Lord, even that Sinai from before the God of Israel." (Compare also Habakkuk iii.) D. C. would probably reply that this is not mentioned in the Pentateuch. But the brevity of sketch there given of the wanderings in the wilderness, the almost total silence as to thirty-eight years, made it impossible to record all that God had done for His people. Mere omission is no reasonable ground for objection. D. C. no doubt believes that Moses and the children of Israel used to sleep in the wilderness, and yet this is nowhere mentioned. And this is also an answer to D. C.'s assertion that the Israelites were not scattered away from the sanctuary, because it is not recorded. Necessity has no law; and even if the Israelites had been commanded to remain together, they were too rebellious to obey the command, especially when stimulated by the necessity of seeking food[7]. When, therefore, the

[7] Since writing the above, an interesting letter, by the Rev. J. L. Porter, of Belfast, has appeared in the "Athenæum" of Jan. 3, 1863. In answer to D. C.'s objection with regard to the camp, this learned traveller says,—"It is assumed that the whole two millions of people were grouped together in a camp. This is opposed alike to the whole tenor of the narrative and to common sense. Any one who

nature of the wilderness, the possible changes that have probably occurred since the days of Moses, and the gracious interpositions of the Lord are considered, there can be no real difficulty as to the food necessary for the flocks and herds of Israel.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XIII. *The Number of Israelites, and Extent of the Land of Canaan.*

"I will send My fear before thee, and will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come,

has had an opportunity of visiting the great Arab tribes of the Syrian desert, can see that the Bishop's difficulties are purely imaginary. The Israelites had immense flocks and herds (Exod. xii. 38): these from the necessity of the case, and like the flocks of the modern Bedouin, were scattered far and wide over the peninsula, and probably over the plain northwards. On one occasion I rode for two successive days through the flocks of a section of the Anazeh tribe and the encampment of the chief was then at a noted fountain thirty miles distant at right angles to my course; yet the country was swarming with men and women, boys and girls, looking after the cattle. In like manner the great bulk of the Israelites would be scattered over the desert. The camp would thus be a mere nucleus; large, no doubt, but not approaching the exaggerated estimate of Bishop Colenso. Yet, being the head-quarters of the nation, containing the Tabernacle, the priests and the chiefs, and forming the rallying-point for the warriors, it was the only place with which the sacred historian was concerned."—Compare Dr. S. Davidson, Introduction, vol. i. pp. 326, 327.

and I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee. And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee. I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee. By little and little I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land." Exod. xxiii. 27—30.

Upon this D. C. remarks, that if the land of Canaan had in it two millions of Israelites, it would be about as thickly inhabited as the three counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. But it cannot be said that "these counties, with their flourishing towns and their innumerable villages, are in any danger of lying 'desolate,' with the beasts of the field multiplying against the human inhabitants." But every considerate reader can see that the cases are not parallel. These counties have no wild beasts, except the fox, either within or near them: Canaan had both. There were wild beasts in the land, and there were plenty in the desert on the east, and in the Lebanon. Besides, D. C. seems to suppose, though his language is not very clear, that the desolation would be caused by the multiplication of wild beasts. But this is not the meaning. God promises not to drive out the Canaanites in

one year for two reasons: first, lest the land should be desolate; secondly, lest the beasts of the field should multiply against them. Now if the whole population of Canaan had been destroyed in one year, which implies continued fighting, disorder, and neglect of agricultural pursuits, was there not a danger that the following year there would be no crops? Let the three favoured counties of England be one year the theatre of war, the inhabitants be slain or driven out, and no cultivation of the land, what would be their condition the following year? Beyond all doubt, they would be desolate, and it would take some time before the invaders could settle down, and become cultivators. In this state of things, in a country like Canaan, when there were wild beasts in the land, and abundance in the neighbourhood; when the fields and roads and cities would all be full of the corpses of slain and unburied Canaanites, there would be the greatest possible danger of the wild beasts multiplying against the new comers, and even disputing possession with them. Even in France, with its immense population, wolves increased during the revolutionary troubles and confusion from 1793 on, to such a degree as to cause serious alarm, and to cause high rewards to be offered by the National Convention for their destruction. In 1797 no less than 5351 wolves

were destroyed, and the alarm had not subsided even in the year 1800[8]. The comparison with the colony of Natal is equally, or rather more delusive. He says the colonists, although only 150,000 altogether, on a space of 18,000 square miles, are not afraid of wild beasts. But in the first place, the European colonists have fire-arms, which the Israelites had not. In the second place, Natal began to be colonized by Europeans in 1836, twenty-six years ago. In the third place, when the first Dutch boors arrived, the whole native population of the country was not destroyed. Had they been extirpated the first year, the difficulties with wild beasts might have been very inconvenient.

D. C. seems also to find a difficulty with regard to the land of Canaan, as to its capability of maintaining or containing the two millions of Israelites, with the aboriginal inhabitants "who filled the land." That the Canaanites *filled* the land, is said without any proof of any kind. As to the fertility and capabilities of the land, that question was settled long ago by the Abbé Guénée[9], in his memoir on the fertility of Palestine. With regard to the proportion of the land to the population, Mr. Porter, in the letter quoted above, says, "The population of the land at the present

[8] "Les Loups dans la Béauce," par Ad. Lecocq, p. 24.

[9] "Récherches sur la Judée," at the end of the Third Volume of "Lettres de quelques Juifs à M. de Voltaire."

moment is about two millions, or about equal to the number of the Israelites at the Exodus: and I can testify that *more than three-fourths* of the richest and best of the country lies *completely desolate*. The vast plains of Moab and Esdraelon, and the whole valley of the Jordan, are without an inhabitant. In the plains of Philistia, Sharon, Cœlosyria, and Hamath, not *one-tenth* of the soil is under cultivation. In one section of Bashan, I saw upwards of seventy *deserted* towns and villages." Besides the two millions, therefore, there would be plenty of room for the old inhabitants of Canaan.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XIV. *The Number of the Firstborn.*

"All the firstborn males, from a month old and upwards, of those that were numbered, were twenty and two thousand two hundred threescore and thirteen. Numb. iii. 43." "Let us see what this statement implies, when treated as a simple matter of fact. For this purpose, I quote the words of Kurtz, iii. p. 209:—

"'If there were 600,000 males of twenty years and upwards, the whole number of males may be reckoned at 900,000 [he elsewhere reckons 1,000,000], in which case there would be only *one* firstborn to *forty-two* [forty-four males]

In other words, the number of boys in every family must have been on the average forty-two.'"

To this I reply, that this unusual number of boys is got only by using the word *firstborn* in a different sense from that in which it is used in every other place in Scripture. The usual sense is, when applied to human offspring, the firstborn of both father and mother. D. C. and Kurtz affirm that it means the firstborn of the mother only.

"And these were not the firstborn on the *father's* side, as Michaelis supposes, so that a man might have many wives and many children, but only one firstborn, as was the case with Jacob himself. They are expressly stated to have been the firstborn on the *mother's* side—'all the firstborn that openeth the matrix,' Numb. iii. 12." Now, in the words on which D. C. builds, there are two requisites laid down as to those instead of whom the Levites were to be taken: first, that they were to be בכור, firstborn, or as it is used, first-begotten of the Father; secondly, opener of the matrix. If D. C. will look at the accents, he will see that this is the sense given by the accentuators. "Every first-begotten, opener of the matrix, of the sons of Israel." That *B'kor* means first-begotten, is evident from the usage of the Bible, in passages to which D. C. alludes, but whose testimony he rejects. Jacob had several wives, and therefore might have had, on

D. C.'s principle, four firstborns. But only one, the first-begotten, Reuben, is reckoned as *B'kor*, "firstborn," throughout the Bible. In the next place, Gideon "had many wives," Judges viii. 30, and one concubine is also mentioned. He might, therefore, have had many firstborn, but Scripture counts only one as his firstborn. "And he said to Jether his firstborn, Up, and slay them" (*ib.* ver. 20). David had also many wives, but only one *B'kor*, first-begotten, Amnon. 2 Sam. iii. 2. Indeed, it is plain to common sense, that there could not be many firstborns in one family, without inconvenience, quarrelling, and litigation. From the days of Jacob and Esau on, there were rights of primogeniture, which were of the utmost importance, and the Law expressly decides, that if a man has several wives, only one can be the *B'kor*, or firstborn, the heir to the privileges and advantages belonging to that position. "If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have born him sons [בנים], both the beloved and the hated, and if the *B'kor*, the first-begotten son, be hers that was hated; then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved, *B'kor*, first-begotten, before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-begotten." Deut. xxi. 15, 16. Here the word *B'kor* can mean nothing but first-begotten, for each of the two wives had a firstborn son, and might claim equal rights, but only one is

B'kor, the first-begotten. D. C. says, this is nothing to the purpose. But they who adhere to the ordinary rules of exegesis, and believe that the author is the best interpreter of his own words, and that a passage is not to be isolated from all other similar passages, and explained by itself, without any regard to the *usus loquendi*, will think this decision of the Lawgiver of the utmost importance. The meaning of the word is here given to prevent injustice and strife, and is therefore definite; and this decision is confirmed by the cases of Jacob, Gideon, and David. We have therefore the practice, as well as the Law, and can have no doubt about the meaning of *B'kor*. Now, this of itself will take away much of the force of D. C.'s objection. One man might have, in fact, four families, like Jacob, or six like David, at Hebron, or many, like Gideon, and yet have only one firstborn, or might not have a firstborn at all. The males of these families would go to swell the total number of the males, and a modern arithmetician calculating according to modern statistics, where each man has usually only one family, would be altogether in the wrong, if he were to pronounce the narrative unhistoric, because there was only one firstborn in six or more families. D. C.'s objection, founded on a calculation made from false data, cannot prove the number of firstborn here given unhistoric. To what extent polygamy and

concubinage prevailed, it is impossible to say; but as both were lawful, they must have prevailed in some degree.

But then the passage to which D. C. refers imposes a second limitation. Those reckoned as firstborn were not only to be *B'korim*, first-begotten of the father, but also firstborn of the mother. If therefore a man married a woman who had already had children, his first-begotten was not a firstborn according to the requirements here laid down: and therefore though he might have a large family, he would have no firstborn, not even if he took other wives afterwards, who never had had children. Their firstborn would not be *first-begotten*, and therefore not answer the requirements here laid down in those to be numbered. For such cases, again, many would have to be struck off from those required by modern statistics, and help to account for the smallness of the number here reckoned as first-born. Then, again, the circumstances of the 900,000 males, who were alive at the time of the census, must be taken into consideration. There were, first, those not a month old, not reckoned; secondly, those above a month old, say up to twenty; thirdly, the parents of these, or, more correctly, the generation to which their parents belonged; fourthly, the generation of their grand-fathers; and as some must have been as old as Moses and Aaron, the generation of their great-

grandfathers. And if we take into account the great difference that there is between the eldest and the youngest child in families, especially where there are second or third marriages, often twenty, sometimes thirty years, there may have been representatives of the families of the great-great-grandfathers. Thus there may have been in the 900,000 five generations. Amongst the eldest, that of the great-great-grandfathers, all the firstborn would probably be dead. In the generation of great-grandfathers, many firstborn would also have been in eternity. Even in the generation of grandfathers and fathers, not a few had passed away, though many representatives of these generations still lived. Amongst the children between one month and twenty years of age, many firstborn were in their graves. How many mothers lose their first child in child-birth? How many families lose their eldest in infancy? All these would diminish from the number of the firstborn, and set modern statisticians at fault. Indeed, I suspect, that if the number of the first-begotten in families were now taken, the result would be very different from that required by the *à priori* reasonings of arithmeticians. But, besides, there were also the firstborn who had perished in the murder of the male children, commanded by Pharaoh. When all these things are taken into consideration, the small number of firstborn will not prove a serious difficulty to

any reasonable man. The real number must be calculated not according to the ratio of the first-born in modern times to all the males, or all the families, but according to the limitations of the Divine Law; and allowance be made for all those who had already died in a good old age, those who had died in middle life, in youth and infancy, or who had been murdered in Egypt. The small number will then appear as a proof of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, as it must in every case of the fidelity of the historian; who, if an impostor, would naturally be inclined to magnify his nation by high numbers. But let it be remembered, that if high numbers had been given they would also have furnished a ground of objection to those, who first reject the doctrine of inspiration, and then seek for reasons to justify their unbelief.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XV. *The Sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt.*

D. C.'s fifteenth chapter discusses the meaning of Exod. xii. 40: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years." Ewald, Kurtz, and other foreign scholars, believe that these four hundred and thirty years begin at the going down of Jacob to his son Joseph. The object of D. C.'s discussion is to prove, on the contrary,

that these four hundred and thirty years must be reckoned from Abraham's call in the land of Haran; and in this most persons in England will agree with him; dividing these four hundred and thirty years into two portions,—two hundred and fifteen from Abraham to Jacob's descent into Egypt, and two hundred and fifteen more from that to the exodus. Here, then, happily, there is no need of controversy. It is to be regretted that D. C. could not prove what is necessary to his argument without insinuating a doubt against important portions of the history. 'This [i.e. the above mode of calculation] will agree better with the statements made above, as to the birth of Moses, though even then not without a strain upon one's faith. Thus, Moses was born eighty years before the exodus, or one hundred and thirty-five years after the migration into Egypt. And Levi may have had Jochebed born to him (as Abraham had Isaac), when one hundred years old; that is to say, fifty-seven years after the migration into Egypt, since he was at that time fifty-three years old; in which case Jochebed would have been seventy-eight years old when she bare Moses; younger, therefore, by twelve years than Sarah at the birth of Isaac." Some have endeavoured to remove an apparent difficulty, by saying that Jochebed was not the actual daughter of Levi, but a granddaughter, or later descendant, as בת may be used

in this sense. But, to my mind, there is no necessity for this solution. The whole history of Israel, from Abraham on, is miraculous. The life of Moses is miraculous. It is, therefore, no strain on my faith to believe that the birth of Moses was as miraculous as that of Isaac.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XVI. *The Exodus in the Fourth Generation.*

Chapter sixteen is devoted to prove that Gen. xv. 16, "In the fourth generation they shall come hither again," can only mean "In the fourth generation, reckoning from the time when they should leave the land of Canaan, and go down into Egypt." It is rather too much for D. C. to say that those words can have no other meaning. Some of the best interpreters, ancient and modern, have held, that the Hebrew word *Dor* here means age, *seculum*—one hundred years; and that the words refer back to the four hundred years mentioned in verse 13[1]. And this is the sense required by the context.

Abraham was informed that in about four hundred years from the time when God was speaking his posterity should return. If *Dor* meant "generation," in D. C.'s sense, Abraham

[1] So for example Calvin, Castellio, Junius, Cornelius à Lapide, Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, Delitzsch, &c. &c.

could not have understood it. He knew nothing of the generations from Jacob's descent to the exodus. But he had just heard of the four hundred years. By fourth generation he would, therefore, naturally understand "the fourth century" from his own time, "*in quarto seculo.*" D. C. himself shows that his own sense of "fourth generation" is not strictly true. He is not even certain as to which is the first generation, from which the fourth generation is to be reckoned. He says, for example, "Thus we find Moses and Aaron in the fourth generation from the time of the migration, viz. Jacob—Levi—Kohath—Amram—Aaron. Or, as Jacob was so aged, and Moses and Aaron also were in life beyond the military age, we may reckon from those as Levi, who went down into Egypt in the prime of life, and then the generation of Joshua, Eleazar, &c., in the prime of life, will be the fourth generation." Now is not this very strange chronology, and very strange reckoning? You may begin with the father, or you may begin with the sons, says D. C., any how, *in utroque casu* we shall make out four generations. But, with all submission, if we begin with Jacob,—and why should we not?—then I find to Moses and Aaron, five generations; and to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, five; and to Achan, six; namely, Jacob, Judah, Zarah, Zabdi, Carmi, Achan; and Nahshon seven, Jacob,

Judah, Pharez, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, Nahshon; and to Bezaleel eight, namely, Judah, Pharez, Hezron, Caleb, Hur, Uri, Bezaleel. To the daughters of Zelophehad also eight, Jacob, Joseph, Manasseh, Machir, Gilead, Hepher, Zelophehad, Zelophehad's daughters. Thus by the very genealogies which D. C. selects it is proved that "in the fourth *Dor*" cannot mean "fourth generation," in the ordinary sense of the term; and that, therefore, D. C.'s heading to the sixteenth chapter, "The exodus in the fourth generation," is not accurate. According to his own calculation, some went up in the fourth, others in the fifth, sixth, and some in the seventh and eighth generations,—Joshua in the ninth. Of course D. C.'s objection looks much bigger and more formidable when it is stated in this way, "The Israelites came out of Egypt in the fourth generation from their leaving Canaan to go down into that country; and in four generations it is impossible that seventy souls could grow into two millions." But this is the statement of one more intent upon magnifying an objection than expressing the simple and accurate truth. D. C., by referring to Nahshon and Bezaleel, proves to any attentive reader that the statement is inaccurate and untrue, and an objection founded upon untruth cannot prove the character of the Pentateuch to be unhistoric. Indeed, when D. C. says, "If we examine the

different genealogies of remarkable men which are given in various places of the Pentateuch we shall find, that, as a rule, the contemporaries of Moses and Aaron are descendants in the *third*, and those of Joshua and Eleazar in the fourth generation," he helps to prove the historic character of the book which he attacks. To make real genealogies all agree in any narrative is difficult, in fiction next to impossible. The consistency, therefore, of those to which D. C. alludes, proves either that the genealogies are genuine, and the narrative historic, or, at the very least, that the writer was not so devoid of understanding as D. C. occasionally supposes him to be. That there must have been more than four generations from the going down into Egypt to the exodus, is plain from the number of years between the two which D. C. adopts. That number is two hundred and fifteen. In two hundred and fifteen years, reckoning thirty years as a generation, there might be seven. If we reckon twenty-five, there might be eight, or rather nearly nine; and, if the children married early, say at twenty, there might be ten. In point of fact, we find from 1 Chron. vii. 22—27, that Joshua was the eighth from Ephraim, and the ninth from Joseph—Joseph, Ephraim, Rephah, Telah, Tahan, Laadan, Ammihud, Elishama, Nun, Jehoshuah. To this genealogy D. C. alludes thus:—"But in

1 Chron. vii. 22—27 we have a remarkable exception to the above rule, where we find the genealogy of Joshua given as follows: 'Joshua the son of Nun, the son of Elishama, the son of Ammihud, the son of Laadan, the son of Tahan the son of Telah, the son of Rephah, the son of Beriah, the son of Ephraim,' that is to say, Joshua is given in the *ninth* generation from Ephraim, or the *tenth* from Joseph." To get rid of this inopportune appearance, D. C. says first, This is an exception to the rule which prevails universally in the Pentateuch. It has just been shown that in the genealogies cited by D. C. himself there is no universally prevailing rule. Achan appears in the sixth generation, Nahshon in the seventh, Bezaleel and the daughters of Zelophehad in the eighth. That Joshua should appear in the ninth, or, as D. C. reckons, the tenth, is therefore nothing wonderful. On the contrary, it is a proof of the historic character and genuineness of the genealogies. If within the given period of two hundred and fifteen years all the families of the twelve sons of Jacob had been represented as having the same number of descents or generations, there would have been just ground for suspecting that the genealogies were fictitious. Take any twelve schoolfellows who start in life about the same age, and see the variety there is in the time of their marriages, and, consequently, in the birth of their

children. One is a grandfather long before the children of another are adults. Diversity in the number of descents is that which is the rule in the ordinary course of family history; and if it be found in the Bible, it is a proof of the historic and not of the unhistoric character of that book.

D. C. observes, secondly, "We are not here concerned with the Books of Chronicles (which, says SCOTT, 'it is generally agreed were compiled by Ezra') rather, perhaps, by the same author who wrote the Book of Ezra (but which were certainly composed long after the captivity), but with the narrative in the Pentateuch itself and Book of Joshua, and must abide by the data which they furnish." But why must we abide by the Pentateuch? In a critical examination of any one book of the Bible, the whole range of Hebrew Scripture is necessary to come to a just conclusion. In the matter of genealogies, later lists are of the utmost importance to check, verify, or disprove. If there were two claimants of a peerage or an estate, the question of pedigree would not be decided by an early genealogy put forward by one party. Every possible list of ancestry and lineal descent would be weighed. D. C. tries to throw discredit upon the genealogies of Chronicles, because he says these books were composed by some writer after the captivity. To which we reply, they may have been compiled after the captivity, but not invented. They bear

the marks of having been extracted and compiled from genuine documents according to the requirements of those who returned from Babylon. Families were not likely to lose the title-deeds of their estates, and therefore much greater Biblical scholars than our objector regard them as precious relics of antiquity. Movers[2] and Bertheau pronounce them historical; and even De Wette himself, after perusing the work of Movers, "recalled, in the later edition of his Introduction his hard and unwarranted judgment concerning the credibility of Chronicles[3]." After pointing out the various sources from which these genealogies were drawn, Bertheau sums up thus:—"To be brief, various considerations lead us to the certain conclusion, that the author of the Chronicles was able to draw from more ancient lists of the divisions of the tribes and their number, perhaps also from other documents besides; but certainly, according to his own references, from historical works, in which were collected the results of the official census-taking of the families and their numberings[4]." After the acknowledgments of such critics few persons will follow D. C. in rejecting the testimony of the Chronicles, when he finds it inconvenient to his theory; for when it suits him, as in the

[2] "Kritische Untersuchungen."
[3] Bertheau's Commentary, Introduction, p. xlix.
[4] Einleitung, p. xxxi.

genealogies of Jair and Bezaleel, he refers to it without scruple—and also to the Book of Ruth, though he would here confine us to the Pentateuch.

But D. C. professes to examine the statement as to the genealogy of Joshua, and here he finds this difficulty:—

"Hence, since the Exodus took place 215 years at most after the migration into Egypt, there must have intervened between the birth of Telah and that of Joshua, 215—70—45, that is, 100 years, so that, according to the chronicler, there must have been six complete generations in 100 years, which is hardly credible."

In reply to this we must remark, first of all, that D. C., though he professes to give the genealogy of Joshua as it is found in the Bible, and even puts his words into quotation marks, has not given it as it stands in the Bible, but a mere statement of his own; hiding a difficulty, and constructing it so as to be most favourable to his theory. His statement is in these words, 'But in 1 Chron. vii. 22—27, we have a remarkable exception to the above rule, where we find the genealogy of Joshua given as follows:—Joshua, the son of Nun, the son of Elishama, the son of Ammihud, the son of Laadan, the son of Telah, the son of Rephah, the son of Beriah, the son of Ephraim [the son of Joseph],' that is to say, Joshua is given in the *ninth* generation

from Ephraim, or the *tenth* from Joseph." Her D. C. assumes, without any hesitation, that Re phah is the son of Beriah, which gives him on generation more, and makes the difficulty th greater. But now let the reader turn to th Bible and read the verses referred to by D. C. and he will find it thus written, ver. 22, "An Ephraim their father mourned many days, an his brethren came to comfort him. 23 An when he went in to his wife, she conceived and bare a son, and he called his name Beriah because it went evil with his house. 24 (An his daughter was Sherah, who built Beth-horo the nether, and the upper, and Uzzen-sherah. 25 And Rephah his son, also Resheph, and Tela his son, and Tahan his son, 26 Laadan his son Ammihud his son, Elishama his son, Non hi son, Joshua his son." The reader sees in ver. 25 the words, "And Rephah his son," which D. C refers to Beriah in the twenty-third verse withou noticing the connexion with the twenty-fourt verse. Ephraim is the subject in the twenty third and twenty-fifth verses. "And when h (Ephraim) went in to his wife, she conceived, an bare a son, and he (Ephraim) called his nam Beriah, because it went evil with his (Ephraim's house. And his daughter was Sherah." Her "his" must also refer to Ephraim, as D. C himself allows, because he thinks it makes anothe difficulty. But if "his daughter," in ver. 24, b

Ephraim's daughter, then "and Rephah his son" must also be Ephraim's son; and therefore Beriah is not to be included in Joshua's genealogy, and Joshua is not in the ninth, but in the eighth generation from Ephraim; and therefore D. C.'s difficulty vanishes. He supposes that Joshua was forty-five at the Exodus, and that Telah was born about seventy years after the descent into Egypt; therefore, he says, 215—70—45 would leave only 100 years for six complete generations. But suppose that Ephraim was born three years after his father Joseph's exaltation, that is, in the third year of plenty; add the remaining four years of plenty and two of the famine, then at the immigration he must have been nine years of age. Suppose then Rephah was born in the twenty-second year after, Ephraim would be then thirty—and that Telah was born twenty-five years afterwards, that would be in the forty-seventh year of the descent. If D. C.'s supposition about Joshua's age be true, he must have been born in the one hundred and seventieth year. This would make 123 years between the birth of Telah and that of Joshua for five generations, a time amply sufficient, even allowing nearly twenty-five years for a generation. But, if the ordinary chronology be correct, according to which Joshua lived twenty-five years after entering the promised land, and he died 110 years old, then deducting these 25 + 40 that he spent in the wilderness, i. e. 65 from

110, he was at the Exodus only thirty-five, and therefore the years between the birth of Joshua and that of Telah would be 133 years, for five generations.

But then D. C. has another difficulty. "According to the Chronicles, 'Elishama, the son of Ammihud,' was the grandfather of Joshua. But Elishama, the son of Ammihud, was himself the captain of the host of Ephraim, Numb. ii. 18 about a year after his *grandson*, Joshua, had commanded the whole Hebrew force which fought against Amalek, Exod. xvii. 8—16, which also is hardly credible."—Why? Suppose Joshua thirty-five when he fought against Amalek, and his father Nun twenty-five at Joshua's birth, and Ammihud twenty-five at Nun's birth, we get $35 + 25 + 25 = 85$. But that was not too old to be captain or rather *Prince* of the sons of Ephraim, not of the host, as D. C. has it. The word נשיא, *Nasi*, does not imply that his office compelled him to take the field in war, though even if it did, there would be nothing incredible in a man of eighty-five commanding an army.

With these objections D. C. is not content but has another difficulty still.

"But, in truth, the account of Joshua's descent in 1 Chron. vii. involves a palpable contradiction. Thus in ver. 24 we are told that Ephraim's *daughter* built two villages in the land of Canaan. If we suppose this to mean that the *descendants* of Ephraim's daughter, after

the conquest, in the time of Joshua, did this, yet in ver. 22, 23, we have this most astonishing fact stated, that Ephraim himself, after the slaughter by the men of Gath of his descendants in the seventh generation, 'mourned many days,' and then married again, and had a son, Beriah, who was *the ancestor of Joshua!* This Beriah, however, is not named at all among the sons of Ephraim in the list given in Numb. xxvi. 35."

Here the first difficulty is in explaining Ephraim's daughter to mean her descendants. But this explanation is not necessary. The fact is stated that Ephraim's daughter did build two villages. The circumstances are not stated. The building may have taken place, for aught that is told us, during Ephraim's lifetime, and not after the conquest, for then they were already in existence, Josh. x. 10; xvi. Had we all the circumstances of the case, we might decide upon the difficulty of believing or not believing; but as they are not told, no fair objection can be founded on the narrative. But D. C.'s statement, that Ephraim mourned for his descendants in the seventh generation, is founded on a misinterpretation of the text. In 1 Chron. vii. 20—22, we read, "And the sons of Ephraim, Shuthelah and Bered his son, and Tahath his son, and Eladah his son, (21,) and Zabad his son, and Shuthelah his son, and Ezer and Elead, whom the men that were born in that land slew,

because (or rather, for) they, the men of Gath, came down to take away their cattle." D. C. seems to suppose Ezer and Elead were the sons of the second Shuthelah; but the change of style forbids this. The Bible does not say, "And Shuthelah his son, and Ezer and Elead his sons," but "Shuthelah his son, and Ezer and Elead." They were not sons of Shuthelah—the "and" does not connect them with Shuthelah the second, but Shuthelah the first. "These are the sons of Ephraim, Shuthelah and his posterity, and Ezer and Elead," as Bertheau says, in loc.: "The two last named, Ezer and Elead, must be considered sons of Ephraim, so that they continue the line begun with Shuthelah in verse 20." Ephraim did not, therefore, mourn for his descendants in the seventh generation, but for his own sons, born after the first Shuthelah, who, it appears, were killed by the men of Gath, i. e. the Philistines, who came down upon a foray to take their cattle. The verb, "came down," must refer to the Gathites, as "come down" is never used of a journey from Egypt to Palestine—that is always "go up;" and therefore the word "because" in the English version is incorrect. It must be, "whom the men of Gath slew, for, or when (כי) they came down to take their cattle." It is therefore quite possible that Ephraim could first mourn for his slain sons, and afterwards have another son, Beriah,

and that Beriah might be a progenitor of Joshua, though we have already shown that he was not. There is, then, no just reason for rejecting Joshua's genealogy in Chronicles. He was the eighth in descent from Ephraim, and the ninth from Joseph, and the tenth from Jacob. This examination of the genealogies, therefore, proves the very opposite of what D. C. intended. He has adduced them to show that the Israelites returned in the fourth generation from the sons of Jacob. But they prove that Moses, Aaron, and others of the same age, went up in the fourth generation; Achan in the fifth from Judah, Nahshon in the sixth; Bezaleel and the daughters of Zelophehad in the eighth; and Joshua in the ninth from Joseph. The objection, therefore, that the posterity of Jacob's sons could not have multiplied into two millions in four generations is untenable. In different families, just as we see at the present day, there was a difference in the number of descents in the 215 years. Indeed, if we had not had the names and genealogies, we could have inferred that there must have been more than four generations. Moses was eighty, Aaron eighty-three, at the time of the exodus. Were there no younger generations? If not, how could the numbering be taken from twenty years old and upwards? D. C.'s zeal must sadly have clouded his understanding when he wrote the words, "the exodus in the fourth 'generation.'"

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XVII. *The Number of Israelites at the Exodus.*

The object of this chapter is to prove that it was impossible for the seventy souls who came down into Egypt to have multiplied in four generations into two millions of people, of whom 600,000 were fit for military service[5]. In order to make out his case, he first asserts "that we nowhere read of any very *large families* among the children of Jacob or their descendants to the time of the Exodus." Secondly, he assumes that after the descent into Egypt the twelve sons of Jacob, without exception, had no more sons than they brought with them: that therefore, in the generation of Kohath, from which he begins his computation, there were only fifty-one males; and that these increased subsequently at the same rate—four and a half sons to each.

Now that the children of Israel had large families is evidently implied in the words, "And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them." Even in English, this accumulation of words, "were fruitful, increased abundantly, multiplied, waxed exceeding strong," expresses an extraor-

[5] Here again D. C. says 600,000 *warriors*. But it has been explained above that this is not correct. There were 600,000 liable to be called upon for military service.

dinary increase. The Hebrew for "increased abundantly," וישרצו, means literally, "they swarmed," like fish. Compare Gen. i. 20, 21. Now how was this possible, if there were no large families? The intention of the author is evidently to imply that the families were unusually large, and the rate of increase extraordinary; and this is referred to, 1 Chron. iv. 27, where we are told of Shimei, a descendant of Simeon, that he "had sixteen sons and six daughters; but his brethren had not many children, neither did they multiply like to the children of Judah." Here is an instance of a large family, and also an indication that the family of Judah had multiplied in an extraordinary manner. The words of Exod. i. 7 are quite sufficient to refute the assertion that there were no large families, and also to show that the rate of increase given by D. C. is far below the truth. But now let us examine the assumption that the twelve sons of Judah had no children after they came into Egypt, except Levi, who had one daughter, Jochebed. Is it likely that all increase ceased after leaving Canaan? These men were all in full vigour of manhood, and their wives probably younger. According to D. C., Reuben was about forty-six, Simeon forty-five, Levi forty-four, Judah forty-two[6], the remaining brothers

[6] Or, as is more probable, 53, 52, 51, 50.

younger. Joseph lived seventy years after the immigration; had he no children besides Ephraim and Manasseh? Then, again, had Dinah, and Serah, the daughter of Asher, no children? They are expressly reckoned amongst the seventy progenitors of Israel. "Seventy souls, thy fathers, came into Egypt," Deut. x. 23. Without Dinah and Serah, the fathers would only be sixty-eight. They must, therefore, have had posterity reckoned amongst the children of Israel, though not named. The natural supposition and the high probability that they had children in Egypt is confirmed by the remark, 1 Chron. ii. 4, that Judah had only five sons, which implies that the fact was something extraordinary, and deserves to be recorded. But if Judah had no sons in Egypt, he probably had daughters. To this, of course, the reply will be, that these supposed children of the Patriarchs are not mentioned, and that we must abide by the number of children whose names are given. This argument from silence is well known to be a very unsafe one. Joab and his brothers are always called the sons of Zeruiah—their father is never mentioned: did the author mean to imply that they had no father? When it suits his purpose, D. C. knows well how to supply what is not narrated. Thus, in regard to the Exodus, he supplies children, aged, sick, and women in child-birth, of whom not one word is said in the text; and he would justly be dissatis-

fied if we were to answer that, as they are not mentioned, there were none such. The high degree of probability that there were such makes it justifiable to suppose that there were. And in like manner, the high degree of probability that Jacob's sons, in the vigour of life and living to a good age, did not cease having children when they came into Egypt, makes it equally justifiable to assume that they had, and that therefore D. C.'s assumption, that in the age of Kohath there were only fifty-one males, is contrary to probability and to the words of the narrative, Exod. i. 7. Besides, it is especially to be observed, that *complete genealogies* are not given either in the Pentateuch or Chronicles, but only extracts necessary to point out "the house of the fathers," or to establish the pedigree of some particular person. That this is the fact is proved by some remarkable instances. The children of Ithamar the priest are nowhere mentioned in the Pentateuch, and yet we know that some of his descendants were high priests, 1 Chron. xxiv. 3—6. The two sons of Moses are barely mentioned in the Pentateuch—their posterity, and what became of them, are not mentioned at all; and yet they had posterity, whose names and office were known, as we find from 1 Chron. xxiii. 14—17, and xxiv. 20, 21. In like manner, no sons of Amram are mentioned, except Moses and Aaron, and yet in

Numb. iii. 27, we find the family of the Amramites; and as Aaron and his sons are classed separately as priests, if Amram had no other son but Moses, it seems strange that the sons of Moses and their descendants should be called after Amram, and not after their illustrious father—that Amram and Aaron should be heads of families, and Moses not. Amram must, therefore, have had other children, amongst whom the posterity of Moses were merged, as the Chronicles say, "Now concerning Moses, the man of God, his sons were named of the tribe of Levi." But as we have mentioned this fact, we cannot but remind the reader that it is one of the most striking proofs of the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch. Neither Joshua nor any following writer would have thought for a moment of sinking Moses and his sons in the common crowd of Levites. But, to refer to other families, Reuben had four sons, and yet in Numb. xxvi. the name of only one of his grandsons is given, that of Eliab the son of Pallu, because he was the father of Dathan and Abiram. So in the family of Judah, the children of Shelah are not mentioned, though the family of the Shelanites is. In 1 Chron. iv. 21, we find that he had sons, and that his posterity were numerous and powerful. In like manner, the grandchildren of Napthali are in the Pentateuch passed by in silence, not being heads of families; and

in Chronicles they are also omitted, because, as they continued in captivity after the return from Babylon, their names were not wanted by those who had returned. There are other similar examples, but these are sufficient to prove that the genealogies, though true, are not complete, but only so much of them given as the case required; that, therefore, no inference can be drawn from the silence of the Pentateuch as to the non-existence of other children. The probability is, that besides the fifty-one males of the twelve sons of Jacob, their fathers, with the exception of Judah, had other sons and daughters, after their descent into Egypt; and so had Dinah and Serah; that therefore D. C.'s calculation, founded on the supposition that fifty-one is the number to begin with, must be false. To make a true calculation, we should require to know the number of sons and daughters born in Egypt, and the rate at which they increased. If the eleven sons of Jacob, and also Dinah and Serah, had each four sons—no extravagant number in families "which were fruitful, and swarmed, and waxed exceeding mighty, and filled the land"—we should get fifty-two in addition to the fifty-one, making a total of one hundred and three males to begin the calculation.

The Christian, of course, believes, that these one hundred and three persons had the promised Divine blessing, and increased at a more

than ordinary rate, so as to swarm and fill the land. But for the sake of those who have doubts, it may be well to consider the rates of increase possible in the ordinary course of nature. "The women of Scotland," says Malthus, "appear to be prolific. The average of 6 children to a marriage is frequent; and of 7, and even $7\frac{1}{2}$, not very uncommon. One instance is very curious, as it appears as if this number was actually living to each marriage, which would of course imply, that a much greater number had been and would be born. In the parish of Nigg, in the county of Kincardine, the account says, that there are 57 land families, and 405 children, which gives nearly $7\frac{1}{9}$ each; 42 fisher families, and 314 children, nearly $7\frac{1}{2}$ each. Of the land families which have had no children there were 7; of the fishers, none[7]." Now if the children of Israel increased at the lowest of these rates, 6, and if we adopt D. C.'s favourite number of 51 males as the beginning of the series, we shall get in the seventh generation, an Israelite population of 2,379,456; that is, greater than the number given by Moses, and therefore quite sufficient to furnish 603,550 men fit for military service. But if we calculated rightly we ought to have taken as many females as males, that is, 102, as the first term of the series, and this number, even if we take 4, which is less

[7] An Essay on the Principle of Population, vol. i. p. 459.

than $4\frac{1}{4}$, D. C.'s own rate of increase, would give in the ninth generation, i. e. the generation of Joshua, a population of 6,684,672, three times as many as the Mosaic narrative requires, and leave ample room to allow for the different number of descents in different families, and the consequent reduction in numbers. It is true, that for a continued increase at either of these rates, the circumstances must have been favourable. In the case of the Israelites they were eminently so. The land of Egypt was fertile, the means of supporting a family easily procured, the climate genial, life and property secure, and, according to Aristotle, the fecundity of the women of Egypt extraordinary. "It has been constantly remarked," says the same writer on population, "that all new colonies settled in healthy countries, where room and food were abundant, have constantly made a rapid progress in population. Many of the colonies from ancient Greece, in the course of one or two centuries, appear to have rivalled, and even surpassed their mother cities. . . . It is calculated that the Israelites, though they increased very slowly in the land of Canaan, on settling in a fertile district of Egypt, doubled their numbers every fifteen years, during the whole period of their stay." To him, then, who had made the principle of population his peculiar study, the rapid increase of the Israelites presented no difficulty. Indeed,

he gives similar instances of the increase of the first settlers in North America, who, without fresh immigrants, doubled their number, some in 25, some in 22, and, in the interior of Rhode Island, in 15 years[8]; and yet their circumstances were not nearly so favourable as those of the Israelites, who had not to contend with forests or swamps, or the same amount of labour and fatigue; amongst whom consequently the number of deaths would be much smaller than amongst the original settlers in the New World. Thus, arguing on the ordinary principles of increase under given circumstances, the sum given by Moses as the product of 215 years has in it nothing incredible, nothing to make the narrative unhistoric.

D. C.'s numbers are preposterous. He asserts, that "in order that the 51 males of Kohath's generation might produce 600,000 fighting men, in Joshua's, we must suppose that each man had 46 children (23 of each sex), and each of these 23 sons had 46 children, and so on." But this is plausible, only on the fiction that Joshua came out in the fourth generation, and not in the ninth. Any one who will take the trouble of a little multiplication, may satisfy him or herself of the exaggeration. Multiply 51 by 23, and the product obtained by 23, and this second product

[8] Pp. 517, 518.

by 23, and you will obtain 620,517, the number of males in the generation of Caleb, and there D. C. stops. But unfortunately for him, the generations do not stop, as may be seen on p. 97. After Caleb comes Hur, so that you must multiply again by 23, and then you get 14,271,891. But after that comes Uri, which gives 328,253,493 for the generation of Uri. But after that comes the generation of Bezaleel, which gives 7,549,830,339; and yet there are two more generations if we go on to Joshua But when, by taking 23, D. C.'s rate of increase, we get seven thousand five hundred and forty-nine millions as the male population of Israel, we may be satisfied that his statement is a gross exaggeration, without adding the other generations. D. C. can only prove his statement by arbitrarily cutting down the ninth, eighth, seventh, and sixth generations of the different families into four. His assertion is only true, if you grant false premises. Take the true premises, and the results are ridiculous. It may be remarked also, the number of 2,000,000 can be thus made out without referring to the number of circumcised slaves and heathen, who must have been incorporated with the tribes, and reckoned in the numbering. How large or how small that number may have been, it is impossible to say, but it cannot have been inconsiderable.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XVIII. *The Danites and Levites at the time of the Exodus.*

Here D. C. objects, first, to the number of the tribe of Dan. "Dan," he says, "in the first generation has one son, Gen. xlvi. 2; and, that he had no more born to him in the land of Egypt, and therefore had *only* one son, appears from Numb. xxvi. 42, where the sons of Dan consist of only one family. Hence we may reckon, that in the fourth generation he would have had 27 warriors descended from him, instead of 62,700 as they are numbered in Numb. ii. 26, increased to 64,000 in Numb. xxvi. 43. In order to have this number born to him, we must suppose that Dan's one son, and each of *his* sons and grandsons, must have had 80 children of both sexes."

Now, first supposing that Dan had no children in Egypt. The question is, How many had his son Hushim? D. C. supposes him to have had only three sons, and this to have been the rate of increase. But by what authority does he assign this small number? Can this be called "being fruitful, and multiplying, and swarming, and filling the land?" And why does he stop at the grandsons of Hushim, instead of going on to the fifth and sixth, or eighth generation? Simply to make out his case. His objection has no force unless all the Israelites came out in the fourth descent from the sons of Jacob; and this we

have shown above, from the genealogies quoted by himself, to be false. His extravagant assertion, that to make out the required number, this one son of Dan must have had 80 children, and each of his sons and grandsons have had the same number, is based on the same falsehood. $40 \times 40 \times 40$ will give 64,000. But this only brings us to the generation of Caleb; continue it to Hur, and the tribe of Dan will have 2,560,000 males; and continue it to Uri, and you have 102,400,000: and this, without going on to the generation of Bezaleel, or Zelophehad's daughters, is quite enough to show the incorrectness of D. C.'s figures. Take the right number of generations as given by D. C. on p. 97, or calculate the number of generations that may occur in 215 years; seven generations, if you count each at 30 years, $8\frac{3}{5}$ if you count 25 for each, and the falsehood of D. C.'s figures and reasonings will immediately appear. He says, Hushim must have had 40 sons, and thinks perhaps that this is something incredible. But Ahaziah, king of Judah, had at least 42 brothers, who were slain by Jehu. Ahab had 70 sons, 2 Kings x. 1—14. "Gideon had 70 sons, for he had many wives;" and besides, "Abimelech by a concubine." Jair had 30 sons, Judg. x. 4. Ibzan had 30 sons and 30 daughters. Abdon had 40 sons, and 30 sons' sons, Judg. xii. 9—14. When with this we com-

pare what has come within our own knowledge, that one husband had by one wife 21 children, and another by one wife 22; these numbers, in the case of many wives and concubines, are nothing surprising. But, taking the right number of generations, we require no such high numbers to bring out 62, or 64,000. Suppose that Hushim, the son of Dan, had two sons less than his grandfather Jacob, that is, ten, and that each of these had six sons, and that the males increased in this ratio, we should have in the seventh generation from Dan, i. e. in the generation of Bezaleel, 77,760 males, exceeding the statement in Numbers by about 15,000. This is all on the supposition of Dan having only one son. But that does not follow because the sons of Dan in Numb. xxvi. are all called Hushites. The children born in Egypt were all reckoned under the 70 who came into Egypt. But D. C. has another objection. He says, "We may observe also, that the offspring of the *one* son of Dan, 62,700, is represented as nearly double that of the *ten* sons of Benjamin, 35,400. Numb. ii. 23." But this is nothing surprising, much less impossible or improbable. The family may have been weakly, and may not have increased in the same proportion as others. Some of his sons may have died without any children, a supposition rendered likely by the fact, that in the

second numbering, where the children of the twelve patriarchs are named, Numb. xxvi., only five of Benjamin's sons are mentioned.

In the genealogies and numbers of the Levites D. C. finds still greater difficulties. Levi had three sons, Gershon, Kohath, Merari. Two sons of Gershon are mentioned. Kohath has four sons mentioned. Merari has only two sons mentioned. And yet at the numbering, Numb. iv., Gershon had 2630, Kohath 2750, Merari 3200; and the total, 8580 males between thirty and fifty years of age; whereas, according to D. C.'s calculation, there were in the fourth generation only forty-four Levites altogether. But here, as in reference to the whole population of Israel, he assumes, first, that Gershon, Kohath, and Merari had no more sons than those named; and that the rate of increase is determined by the sons and grandsons actually named. But that his assumption is groundless is proved by the lists under consideration. Gershon has two sons, Libni and Shimei, but no grandsons mentioned; and so Merari has two sons mentioned, Mahali and Mushi, but no grandsons. Thus, according to D. C.'s principle, as no grandsons are mentioned, there were no grandsons; and, therefore, Levi's posterity was continued only in the line of Kohath. But when we come to Numbers iii., then we find that Libni and Shimei, Mahali and Mushi

had sons, and that they were heads of the families of Levites;—that is, that D. C.'s principle is false, and that the names given do not necessarily include the total number of sons born. The sons named are named for some particular reason, as stated above; as, e.g., to present the descent of the chief families, or to give the pedigree of some particular person necessary to be noted; as here, the sons of Izhar are mentioned, because the eldest, Korah, was one of the heads of the rebellion. In like manner, the sons of Uzziel are given, because Mishael and Elzaphan are elsewhere mentioned on a very remarkable occasion. That all the sons of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari are not mentioned, but only those that were necessary for the historian's purpose, is plain from the language in which they are spoken of. In Exod. vi. 14, where the enumeration begins, it is expressly said, "These be the *heads* of their fathers' houses;" then, after enumerating the sons of Reuben, who came into Egypt with him, it is said, "These are the families of Reuben," &c. But when we come to the descendants of Levi, we read, verse 16, "These are the names of the sons of Levi, according to their generations," and then are given the names of the sons of Levi,—Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, who were the heads of the houses of the Levites; and then, after going through a number of names, "These are the heads of the fathers of

the Levites, according to their families." The *heads* only are mentioned. But the designation *head* implies others that were not heads, i. e. there were other sons, who also had children, but not being heads they are not mentioned, but both themselves and their posterity were included in the families of the heads—a principle recognized 1 Chron. xxiii. 11, where it is said, when speaking of the descendants of Gershon, "And Tahath was the chief, and Zizah the second; but Jeush and Beriah did not multiply sons; therefore they were in one reckoning according to their father's house." Here, then, as in the case of the twelve Patriarchs, as only the heads or chief are mentioned, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari must have had more sons than are mentioned. If, therefore, we suppose, as above, that each of Levi's three sons had six sons, and that six is the rate of increase, then in the fifth generation from Gershon, Kohath, and Merari we should have 3,328, which is not very far different from 2,300, the number assigned in the Pentateuch. As in the preceding case, D. C.'s reasoning rests on false premises.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XX. *The Priests, their Duties, and their Perquisites.*

The duties and the perquisites of the Priests furnish the next materials for D. C.'s critical powers. And, first, he enumerates the duties. The Priests had duties to discharge in every case of burnt-offering, meat-offering, peace-offering, sin-offering, trespass-offering: they had to attend the leper, to see him several times, to examine his symptoms, and, in case of cure, to offer the required sacrifices;—and so with regard to certain ceremonial pollutions. Then there were the cases of the Nazarites; the daily sacrifices the additional sacrifices for the Sabbath, and on certain feast days, especially in the seventh month for several days together, besides; and especially the sacrifices of the women after child-birth, of whom D. C. says there must have been at least two hundred and fifty a day, involving five hundred sacrifices; which, allowing five minutes for each, would have occupied forty-two hours, that is, eighteen hours more than the day is long. This certainly looks very formidable; especially as, according to D. C., to do all this work there were only three priests—Aaron (till his death) and his two sons, Eleazar and Ithamar.

What conclusion does D. C. mean to draw from all this? We suppose, that the book of Leviticus is unhistoric; that the Laws are not

Mosaic; that the book of Leviticus, with its wonderful, complex, and detailed system of sacrifice and ceremonial observances, is a forgery. When, then, was it forged? By whom? For what purpose? He admits that it existed in the days of Amos; as he says, that "the words of the Prophet Amos, verse 25, 'Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O House of Israel?' show that, in the Prophet's view, at all events, such sacrifices were required and expected of them;" i.e. about eight hundred years before Christ, in the time of Uzziah and Jeroboam the Second, the book of Leviticus was known, and believed to be historic. The whole system, then, must have been in operation at the time. There was a Temple, and there must have been Priests and Levites, with their duties and their perquisites. It could not, therefore, have been invented or forged then, nor in the preceding generation, nor immediately before that. In fact, such a complicated and burdensome system could not have been imposed, with such various and conflicting interests, at any one time that can be pointed out. In no one generation could the people have been persuaded that they always had Priests and Levites, and innumerable sacrifices, and burdensome laws, and a Tabernacle, if they had not had them. Then, again, who could have forged them? Not a layman. No layman could have spun out such

a system of minute sacrificial rites, binding himself, and taxing himself and his fellows for the support of Priests and Levites to live at ease. Not a Levite; for he would not have subordinated himself and his tribe to the family of Aaron. Not a Priest; for one accustomed to the labours of the sacrificial system, if it had existed, would not have described the whole work as accomplished by three Priests. And no forger whatever would have thought of inserting all the allusions to the camp and camp-life. On D. C.'s own showing, it must have been written in the Desert; and this is the opinion of some of the most learned Rationalists, who, though they do not receive the history, yet believe that the Laws were given and written by Moses, and in the Desert[9]. Now, then, suppose the Laws promulged amongst the people, known, and acted upon, with all D. C.'s difficulties. Aaron and his two sons would soon find the work too much for them. What, then, would they do? Doubtless they would go to Moses, and ask for

[9] "After a longer and more accurate investigation, I am firmly convinced, that a well-ordered collection of Mosaic laws is contained in the Pentateuch." And, again:—"I have been compelled to receive the laws of the seven groups as truly Mosaic." Bertheau, Die Sieben Gruppen mosaischer Gesetze, Preface, pp. vi and ix. Compare Ewald, ii. p. 90, &c., who, although he does not speak so decidedly as Bertheau, makes great admissions. See also Bleek, Einleitung, pp. 175. 182, 183. 186, 187. 192, 193, &c.

help, and say, "We cannot get through, and we cannot call in help, 'for the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.'" And what would Moses do? If he himself, and not God, was the legislator, he would say, "The command to put the stranger to death is only against him who intrudes into the priestly office, not against him who is called to help. You may call some of your brethren of the tribe of Levi, of whom it is said, 'Bring near the tribe of Levi, and present them before the Priest, that they may minister unto him.'" On this principle Moses acted when Nadab and Abihu had offered strange fire before the Lord, and fire went out from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. He called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel, the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, "Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary, out of the camp." Not being priests, they had no business to go in before the Lord, and carry them out; but it would have been cruel to ask Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar to perform this office. Though not absolutely a case of necessity, but only of humanity, Moses exempted Aaron's nephews from the penalty attached to the stranger who should draw near. Mishael and Elzaphan were not intruding into the priest's office, but obeying the command of the legislator, and therefore were free. And so, if Moses commanded the Levites to help

Aaron and his sons in their overpowering labours, they also would have had no reason to fear death. But if, as Christians believe, not Moses, but God was the lawgiver, then Moses would go and inquire of the Lord, who would instruct him how to meet the difficulty. Indeed, for aught that appears to the contrary, Aaron himself and his sons had the necessary authority to call in help, when it was needed, from that tribe which was given to them "to minister unto them." The exclusion of the stranger on pain of death was obviously directed against intruders, not against subordinates obeying the commands of those who had authority. The penalty is not expressed by the words "shall surely die," which might imply miraculous death inflicted by God, but by the word יוּמָת, "shall be put to death," which does not imply any thing supernatural, but is the common word for execution by men[1]. That execution depended upon Aaron and his sons, who surely would not enforce the penalty on those whose help they required. The priests had certainly a discretion in cases of necessity, as we learn from 2 Chron. xxix. 34, where it is said, "But the priests were too few, so that they could not flay all the burnt-offerings: wherefore their brethren the Levites did help them, till the work was ended, and until the other

[1] See, for example, Exod. xxi. 12. 15. 29. Levit. xxiv. 16. 21, and xx. 2. 9, 10, &c.

priests had sanctified themselves." Compare also 2 Chron. xxx. 17.

This is the common-sense answer to the objection taken in its largest sense; for D. C. has magnified the difficulty beyond what the words of the Pentateuch warrant. Thus he says, "In the seventh month, for several days together, besides the daily sacrifice, there were to be extraordinary additional sacrifices; so that on the fifteenth day of the month the *priest* was to offer thirteen bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs, and in the seven days from the fifteenth to the twenty-first, seventy bullocks, fourteen rams, and ninety-eight lambs, Numb. xxix. Lastly, if it should be thought that the above sacrificial system was not meant to be in full operation in the wilderness, we may call attention to the frequent references made, in the enunciation of these laws to the camp, Lev. iv. 12. 21; vi. 11; xiii. 4. 6; xiv. 3. 8, &c." D. C. would persuade his reader, as he believes himself, that all this work of the seventh month was in full operation in the camp, and there may be people so ignorant of the Bible as to receive this statement without hesitation. But any one tolerably acquainted with the Scriptures knows that the feast of the seventh month is the feast of tabernacles, to be celebrated in the Holy Land, as a reminiscence of their fathers having dwelt in tabernacles in the wilderness, and not in the desert. Whilst they were ac-

tually living in tabernacles, they did not want any memento of the kind. But D. C., in searching for pabulum for his difficulties, saw only the amount of work, and forgot, or was ignorant of, the time and place where it was to be accomplished. If he had remembered the parallel passage in Lev. xxiii. 39, "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in *the fruit of the land*, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days," he could not have committed this blunder.

Again, D. C. says, very positively, there were only three priests, "Aaron (till his death), and his two sons, Eleazar and Ithamar." But there was at least one more, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, and as the posterity of Ithamar subsequently attained the high priesthood, he must have had sons at this time. As Aaron was eighty-three when he and Moses were sent to Pharaoh, some of his grandsons must have been of an age to perform priestly duties. How many sons Eleazar and Ithamar may have had, D. C. does not know, and has therefore no warrant for asserting that at the time there were only three priests. But, again, before the separation and consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood there had been priests, who are mentioned before the giving of the Law. "And let the priests also, which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth

upon them." They must have been alive at the time when Aaron and his sons were consecrated, and by Knobel are supposed to have been Levites; as, when Moses was called, the word *Levite* appears to have been a name of office, for God says, Exod. iv. 14, "Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother?" Moses himself was a Levite as to birth, and yet here a distinction is evidently made. Aaron therefore and some of the family of Levi may have been priests before the Exodus. They were present at Sinai, and when there was a need of priests to help might naturally be summoned. This would agree with other dealings of the Almighty. The Divine dispensations have melted one into the other, the Mosaic into the Christian, the patriarchal into the Mosaic. Several patriarchal laws were incorporated into the Sinaitic legislation, as the prohibition to eat blood, circumcision, the law of the levirate. So in Egypt, there may have been Levites priests, of whom Aaron was the head. On the erection of the Tabernacle Aaron and his sons were solemnly consecrated, and none others allowed to intrude themselves on pain of death. This supposition also accounts for the part which Korah and his brethren took in the rebellion against Moses and Aaron.

But in truth D. C.'s searches after difficulties have hindered him from taking the right view of the Levitic sacrifices and institutions. Though

given in the desert, they were given not for the desert, but for the land of promise; and though addressed to Aaron and his sons, they looked forward to the condition of the priesthood of a great nation settled in its own land. When the particular ordinances to which D. C. alludes were commanded, there was no prospect of a forty years' sojourn in the wilderness. The Israelites were soon to march for the Holy Land. As given in the camp, their laws bear the traces of the local circumstances, and these together with the continual reference to Aaron and his sons are allowed to be convincing proofs that they were given by Moses in the wilderness, i. e. that the book of Leviticus is historic and its narrative authentic. So far as it was possible the laws were to be observed wherever the tabernacle of the congregation was, and therefore in the wilderness. But it would take some time for the people to become acquainted with a new and complicated system of sacrifice and observances, and a longer time still for the people to accept and obey them. How long was the struggle in England, before uniformity in the use of the liturgy was general in our parish churches? What is even at the present time, when the population is not in a wilderness, the proportion of those who obey the rubric, "The woman, at the usual time after her delivery shall come into the church, &c., to return thanks?" But take into consideration the

distractions and difficulties of camp-life in a wilderness—the dispersions in search of food for themselves and their cattle, and D. C. may find reason to believe, that the actual duties of the priests are not to be judged by the existence of the commands. The words of Amos, quoted by himself, reprove the people for their remissness in bringing sacrifice [2]. The Israelites, as described in the Pentateuch, were not a particularly tractable people, and, even with the most willing, necessity has no law. With some, obedience would have been impossible—and this is the simple answer about the pigeons and turtledoves, whether D. C.'s assumption, that there were none, or that they were scarce, in the wilderness, be true or not. If they could not be had in the wilderness, they could not offer them. But the Law was not given for the wilderness, but for the land of Palestine, where they abound [3]. If

[2] Many commentators, Jewish and Christian, think that the Israelites in the wilderness brought either very few or no sacrifices during the thirty-eight years. Thus Rashi thinks that they sacrificed the passover only. Aben Ezra thinks that they sacrificed during the year's stay at Sinai, and subsequently at Kadesh, but that during the wanderings they had no wine for the drink-offering, and not sufficient pasture for their flocks.

[3] It is remarkable that the command, Levit. xii. 2, to women after child-birth to bring a young pigeon or turtle-dove, is just one of the commandments which Dr. S. Davidson pronounces to be genuine and Mosaic. See Introduction, vol. i. p. 111.

the Lord accepted a handful of flour from a man too poor to buy a pair of turtledoves or pigeons, where there were plenty, would He not accept it also when none were to be had even by the wealthy? But D. C. has not proved that there were no pigeons or turtledoves in the wilderness. That there are wild doves, who build in rocks and feed on worms, pieces of flesh, and offal, is well known to naturalists, and is, indeed, proved by one of the passages to which D. C. refers: "O, ye that dwell in Moab, leave the cities, and dwell in the rock, and be like the dove, that maketh her nest in the sides of the hole's mouth." The Midianite cities were in the neighbourhood of that very desert in which the Israelites wandered. When therefore they left their cities and went to dwell in rocks, these were the rocks of this great and dreadful desert, so that the prophet's words imply that doves there built their nests.

Similar considerations will solve the difficulty about the priests' *perquisites*, a word not dictated by good taste, nor by unimpassioned earnestness in searching after truth. Suppose that all manner of sacrifices prescribed in the Law had been regularly offered, and that the portions, to which Aaron and his sons had a right, furnished more provision than could possibly be used by them and their families. Suppose that this superabundance of provision caused a special difficulty with regard to that which their families were not

allowed to partake of, but which was to be eaten in the most holy place. Would they not ask Moses what was to be done with the remainder, and would not he either tell them, or ask directions from the Lord? But this supposition is contrary to the facts of the case. Many of these sacrifices which yielded provision to the priest were *voluntary*, depending altogether on the will of the individuals[4]; and even of those that were obligatory, Amos assures us that they were not offered, so that Aaron and his sons were as little encumbered with their "PERQUISITES" as with their duties.

But, again, D. C. finds a difficulty in the number of cities assigned to the children of Aaron. "Further, in Josh. xxi., we have an account of the forty-eight Levitical cities; and we read, ver. 19, 'All the cities of the children of Aaron, the priests, were thirteen cities, with their suburbs.' At this time, according to the story, there was certainly *one* son of Aaron, Eleazar, and one

[4] Upon this fact that many sacrifices were altogether voluntary, the Rabbinical commentators lay great stress in explaining Jer. vii. 22, "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices," referring to Levit. i. 2, "If any man of you bring an offering," which does not require them to bring it, but only prescribes what was to be done, if they brought it.

grandson, Phinehas and his family. Ithamar, Aaron's other son, *may* have been alive; but no mention whatever is made of him. We may suppose, however, that he had sons and daughters. For this small number of persons, then, there are provided here thirteen cities, and their suburbs, and all, let it be observed, *in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem*, where the Temple was built, and where the presence of the priests was especially required, but in a later age." Were the appointment to these cities temporary, only for the age of Joshua, or were these cities to be inhabited by none but the descendants of Aaron, there might be room for surprise; but the assignment of these cities was only a part of the general distribution of the land amongst the tribes, and of the appointment of places of residence and support for the whole tribe of Levi for all time, as long as the children of Israel should inherit the land. But it is nowhere said that these cities were exclusively inhabited by the Levites or the priests. Indeed, of two of the priestly cities, Anathoth and Hebron, we know the contrary. In the latter city we read that David reigned for seven years, and the men of Anathoth who forbade Jeremiah to prophesy are not described as priests. The cities were assigned to the priests and Levites partly for dwelling partly for maintenance. That a larger portion than usual was assigned to the most honourable

family in the land is nothing astonishing. The cities were distributed amongst all the tribes, as the Levites were to be the teachers of the Law. Forty-eight, that is, four cities in each tribe, was the number fixed. But, as Ewald says, "In a few cases this number was altered for particular reasons. The great Judah, together with Simeon, gave together nine; Napthali, on the contrary, only three." . . . . "The distribution of the Levites was made in reference to the three existing chief branches of the family . . . . so that Kohath, the branch most honoured on account of the Aaronic family, should be settled amongst the five and a half tribes in the south, and as far as the middle of the land on this side Jordan—the next following branch amongst the three and a half tribes in the north except Zebulon, the last branch amongst Zebulon, together with Gad and Reuben, on the other side." So that Ewald finds a reason for the distribution independently of any view to the Temple; though, if we believe that the distribution took place under the immediate control of God Almighty, we need not be astonished that the cities of the priests are found, where afterwards they were the most wanted. But that the assignment of the cities was made in the original distribution of the land amongst the tribes, is attested by the fact that it would have been impossible to make it afterwards. The people were not likely to give up the property, which they and their fathers had possessed

for ages. Even a king could not persuade Naboth to exchange his father's heritage for what was better. "The whole land was subject to the common law of property. The great principle of this law was inalienability of estates[5]." That the assignment was made at an early date is further confirmed by the fact, that there is in the history no trace of its having been made at any later period. David or Solomon was the only Israelite king who had power to have made such provision by force. But there is no trace whatever of either having done so. The former took great trouble about the arrangements of public worship. But there is no appearance of his dispersing the Levites over the land or giving them cities. The arrangement must therefore have been on the first possession—and the narrative historical.

Bishop Colenso, Chap. XVI. *The Priests, and their Duties at the Celebration of the Passover.*

"Again, how did these three priests manage at the celebration of the Passover?" Here D. C. finds insurmountable difficulties. First, he supposes that, according to the Law and the narrative, there were only three priests; secondly, that there were 150,000 lambs killed; thirdly, that, at the time of the celebration of the

[5] Dean Milman, i. 177.

second passover (Numb. ix. 3), they were killed in the court of the Tabernacle; fourthly, that they were all killed in two hours; fifthly, that the blood of each was sprinkled by the priests—that is, that the lambs were killed in two hours, at the rate of 1250 a minute, and that each priest must have had to sprinkle the blood in about two hours, that is, at the rate of about 400 lambs every minute for two hours together. The first supposition about the three priests has already been disposed of. The second, that 150,000 lambs were required, has also been partly answered already. It has been shown that the number to eat of one lamb may have been one hundred, or more, according to the exigencies of the case. If there were 1,800,000 Israelites, including male and female, and there were one hundred to each lamb, the number would be 18,000, instead of 150,000. But even this number must be greatly reduced. In the first place, according to a law given and repeated before the second passover, the males alone were required to appear before the Lord, Exod. xxiii. 17, "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God." And again, xxxiv. 23: "Thrice in the year shall all your male children (*lit.*, your males) appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel." This was before the erection of the Tabernacle, and therefore applies to the second passover, here alluded to. In the land of

Israel, the women could not often undertake long journeys, with very young children; and on this account the adult males would appear almost alone at the Tabernacle, and not all of them. In the wilderness, where D. C. admits that lambs (and kids) of a year old must have been scarce, we may well suppose that the Israelites were economical, and that the number of lambs was calculated, not for the whole population, but for those who were absolutely required by the letter of the law to appear. Thus the number 1,800,000, which included both males and females, would sink down to 900,000, and the 18,000 lambs to 9000, instead of 150,000. But even from this deductions must be made: there were all the infant children, who could not eat of the passover; then there were the sick, and the ceremonially unclean, and those necessarily absent attending to the flocks and herds, and scattered about with them, and the disobedient and rebellious. These cannot be numbered at less than 100,000, which would reduce the number of lambs by another thousand, leaving only 8000 to be killed in two hours. That this could be effected in the time is certain, especially if order were observed similar to that which was usual at a later period. The Mishna relates, that "the paschal lambs were slaughtered in three divisions, by three bands or divisions of people. The first division entered the

outer court of the Temple, and when it was full, the doors were shut, and three peculiar blasts blown with the trumpets. The priests stood in two rows, and had in their hands bowls, one row gold, the other silver, but not mixed, and the bowls had no stands, that they could not be set down, and the blood be allowed to curdle. When an Israelite slew his lamb, the priest received the blood in his bowl, and passed it on to him beside him, and he again to the priest beside him, receiving the full bowl, and returning an empty one: then the priest who was next the altar poured it out at one pouring at the base of the altar. When the first division of people went out, the second came in, and so on." Now from the doors of the court of the Tabernacle to the door of the Tabernacle itself was 126 feet, and the court was 90 feet wide. With good arrangements, therefore, and the help of the Levites, the task might have been accomplished within the two hours to which D. C. limits the performance of the work. But he knows well that the correctness of his limitation is very doubtful. The time fixed for killing the paschal lamb was "between the two evenings." Does D. C. know certainly what that expression means, or does any one else now living? He refers to the opinion of the Karaîtes and Samaritans, favoured by Aben Ezra, that the expression, "between the two evenings," means the period between the disap-

pearance of the sun below the horizon and the time when it is quite dark; that is, from six o'clock till about half-past seven; also to the statement of Josephus, "They slay their sacrifices at the Passover from the ninth hour to the eleventh," i. e. from three to five of our time[6]. But D. C. ought to know that the Mishna shows that they were not confined to the hours stated by Josephus. In Pesachim, chap. v. 1, we read, the daily offering was slain half an hour after the eighth hour [i. e. half-past two o'clock], and sacrificed half an hour after the ninth hour [half-past three]. But on the day before the Passover, whether that happened to be on a week day or a Sabbath day, it was slain half an hour after the seventh hour [half-past one], and sacrificed half an hour after the eighth hour. When the day before Passover happened on Friday, it was slain half an hour after the sixth hour [half-past twelve], sacrificed half an hour after the seventh hour [half-past one], and the Passover after that. This shows that they considered the time expressed by the words, "between the evenings," to be from afternoon until sunset; and this is the

[6] The words of Josephus do not say that they killed only from the ninth to the eleventh hour, but seem, as Lundius suggests, to imply that that depended on the number of each company for each lamb. If the number were only ten, then more time would be required; if twenty, the time would be less.

opinion of some of their greatest men, Kimchi, Abendana, &c. In the Commentary of Abendana it is thus expressed: "*Between the evenings* is the period from the declining of the sun towards the west, i. e. from the sixth hour [noon], and onwards, until night. He says, two evenings, for there are two—when the sun begins to decline is the one evening, and after the going down of the sun is the second evening." According to this opinion, approved by Godwin in his "Moses and Aaron," and by Lundius[7], "between the evenings" would be from soon after noon until six o'clock, at least five hours and a half for the killing of the paschal lamb, and therefore abundant time, both in the wilderness and at Shiloh, for killing the number required. This opinion, derived from the Mishna, and approved by the majority of learned Jews, and required even in the Temple by the necessities of the case, is much more probable than that on which D. C.'s objection rests. At all events, no man should found an objection upon data which he himself knows to be uncertain and possibly false.

But, again, this difficulty rests upon another uncertainty. D. C. assumes, that the narrative implies that at this second Passover the blood of

[7] Das Levitische Priesterthum, p. 986.

the paschal lamb was sprinkled by the priests. But neither the original institution nor the account of the second Passover implies any thing of the kind. In the original institution the priests are not mentioned, nor the altar, nor the tabernacle of the congregation. They were not in existence; and the total silence respecting these things—the want of any provision for what was to be done in the land—proves the genuineness and locality of the original command. As these things are not mentioned here, neither are they in the account of the second celebration, Numb. ix. 1—6: "And the Lord spake unto Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, in the first month of the second year, after they were come out of the land of Egypt, saying, Let the children of Israel also keep the passover at his appointed season. In the fourteenth day of this month, at even [between the two evenings], ye shall keep it in his appointed season: according to all the ceremonies thereof ye shall keep it. And Moses spake unto the children of Israel, that they should keep the passover. And they kept the passover on the fourteenth day of the first month at even, in the wilderness of Sinai: according to all that the Lord commanded Moses, so did the children of Israel." Here, again, is not one word about priests sprinkling of blood, or tabernacle of the congregation. The particulars of the observance are not related. We are only

assured that they kept it correctly, according to the Lord's commands by Moses. If they were in any difficulties, they had Moses to consult: and some who were unclean, and could not keep it at the right time, availed themselves of his advice, and were directed to keep it the following month. We may suppose, then, that the others also consulted Moses, and that according as the Lord commanded Moses, so they did. But when we consider that in the original institution there is no mention of the priests' sprinkling the blood, and that not a word is said of it here, the probability is, that on this occasion the blood was not sprinkled. An accurate reasoner would at least say, there is nothing in Exod. xii. compared with Numb. ix. that can warrant us to infer that the blood was sprinkled by the priests. If we are to abide by the words of the Pentateuch—or as D. C. says (p. 101), in italics, "*If we will take the data to be derived from the Pentateuch itself*" — there is no ground for his assumption. Whence, then, does D. C. derive the grounds for his supposition? From that very book which, when it suited his purpose, he had tried to disparage — from the Book of Chronicles.

"Besides which, in the time of Hezekiah and Josiah, when it was desired to keep the passover strictly, 'in such sort as it was written,' 2 Chron. xxx. 5, the lambs were manifestly killed *in the*

court of the Temple. We must suppose, then that the paschal lambs in the wilderness were killed in the court of the Tabernacle, in accordance, in fact, with the strict injunctions of the Levitical law, that all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, should be killed 'before Jehovah,' at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation." Is it safe to conclude, that what was the practice about 800 years subsequently to the second passover, was also the practice in the wilderness? Is it not possible that some modifications may have taken place in consequence of the erection of the Temple and the celebration of the passover in a crowded city, as Jerusalem must have been, when Israelites came from all parts of the land? Is an inference from a later practice to be preferred before the plain words of the Pentateuch? The very most that can be said is, In the days of Hezekiah and Josiah the practice was after this fashion: in the original institution, and at the second celebration nothing of the kind is alluded to, therefore what was done in the wilderness is uncertain. If so D. C. is not justified in treating his own opinion as an infallible certainty, upon which an objection can be founded fatal to the historic character of the narrative. But, says D. C., alluding to Hezekiah's passover, "It is expressly said they had not kept the passover 'of a long time in such sort as it was written.'" 2 Chron. xxx. 5

So that all that was done at this passover, was meant to be done in express agreement with what "was written." And yet in the next sentence, D. C. admits that "there is no specific direction that the blood of the Paschal lambs should be sprinkled by the priests." So that in order to keep the passover, "strictly according to what was written," the priests sprinkled the blood according to what was not written. Not that we impute any violation of the Law to the priests in the time of Hezekiah. Since the second passover, the practice had been altered on competent, i. e. prophetic, authority; as we see in the later chapters of Ezekiel, the prophet, by Divine command, makes numerous alterations respecting the law of sacrifices. But, says D. C., according to the strict injunctions of the Levitical law, 'all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, should be killed 'before Jehovah' at the door of the Tabernacle." But the passover is neither a burnt-offering, nor a peace-offering, nor a sin-offering, nor a trespass-offering. It is an offering *per se*, and therefore these strict injunctions do not apply to it.

There is only one passage in the Pentateuch, which gives the least colour to the theory, about the sprinkling of the blood at the second passover, and it is therefore urged repeatedly, and in that account we quote it at length. In Levit. vii. 1—7, we read, "This is the thing which the

Lord hath commanded, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, saying, What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord, before the Tabernacle of the Lord: blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people: to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them for peace-offerings unto the Lord. And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord. And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a-whoring." From this, it appears that the Israelites were in the habit, even in the wilderness, of offering to strange gods, generally outside the camp, in the open field. To prevent this, God commands that whether the Israelite kills an animal for ordinary eating in the family, or as a voluntary sacrifice, he must bring it to the door of the Tabernacle, and have the blood sprinkled, &c.

But the passover belongs to neither of these cases. It was not killed for ordinary use in the family, nor as a voluntary offering; but by command, on a special occasion, and according to its own special ceremonies. It is not therefore included in this command, which only relates to these two cases.

BISHOP COLENSO, CHAP. XXII. *War on Midian.*

D. C.'s last difficulty is one of his own making. He says, "From the death of Aaron, *the first day of the fifth month*, to the completion of the conquest of the land of Og, we cannot reckon less than six months, and are thus brought to the first day of the eleventh month, which leaves no time for the march to the plains of Moab, Numb. xxii. 1; nor, 2ndly, Balak's sending twice to Balaam, his journey and prophesying, xxii.—xxiv.; nor, 3rdly, Israel's abiding in Shittim, and committing whoredom with the daughters of Moab; nor, 4thly, the death of the 24,000 by the plague; nor, 5thly, the second numbering of the people (xxvi. 6); nor, 6thly, the war upon Midian, during which they burnt all their cities and all their goodly castles, and which must surely have required a month or six weeks for such a transaction." The objection, as I have said, rests entirely upon D. C.'s own conjectures as to the time required for certain transactions, for there is not in the Penta-

teuch itself the least note of time. Are we then to pronounce the Pentateuch unhistoric, because D. C. conjectures that certain events must have occupied six months? That is a great strain, not upon faith, but credulity. But how does he reckon? Thus:—

"1. We are told that 'Aaron died on the *first* day of the *fifth* month of the fortieth year of the wanderings,' Numb. xxxiii. 38; and they mourned for him a month, Numb. xx. 29. 2. After this, 'king Arad fought against Israel, and took some of them prisoners;' whereupon 'the Israelites attacked these Canaanites, and utterly destroyed them and their cities.' Numb. xxi. 3. For which two transactions we may allow another *month*." But how does D. C. know that this took place after the mourning? In the Hebrew text, there is no "after this." It may have been during the month of mourning of which the king of Arad took advantage, or it may even have been before the death of Aaron; for when Mount Hor was mentioned, it was natural immediately to notice the death of Aaron, and to defer the relation of the war with Arad. Then again, even if it were after the death and mourning of Aaron, what reason is there for supposing that the conquest occupied a month? It could only be a small portion of Arad's territory, situate on this side of the mountain barrier in the south, that they could have conquered, and a

single successful battle might have put them in possession of the whole. It could not have been a great or important conquest, or the Israelites could at once have pushed their way into Canaan, without going round about Edom. A week would have been sufficient for the whole affair. At all events, there is not the slightest ground for saying, that it occupied a month. His next calculation is, "3. Then they journeyed from Mount Hor by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom, Numb. xxi. 4; and the people murmured, and were plagued with fiery serpents, and Moses set up the serpent of brass, Numb. xxi. 5—9, for all which we must allow at least a *fortnight.*" But why? Was it not likely that as soon as ever the people heard of the necessity of the retrograde and round-about journey, they murmured, and spake against God; and that the Lord sent fiery serpents among them, of which, according to the accounts of modern travellers, there were plenty in the neighbourhood? For all this, a single day was sufficient. And when they saw that many of the people died, which might easily happen in a few hours, was it likely that they would wait a week or ten days before they asked for help? For this, one day more would be quite sufficient. Count another day for making the brazen serpent, and D. C.'s fortnight is cut down to three days. But then, D. C. goes on: "4. They now marched,

and made nine encampments, Numb. xxi. 10—20, for which we cannot well allow less than *a month.*" But, let any one look at the map, taking as a guide the places of which the situation is certainly known, and bearing in mind that the armed vanguard would go first, and a fortnight will appear amply sufficient, even allowing the two Sabbaths' rest.

Then D. C. says (5): "They sent messengers to Sihon, who 'gathered all his people together, and fought against Israel, and Israel smote him with the edge of the sword, and possessed his land from Arnon unto Jabbok, and took all these cities, and dwelt in all the cities of the Amorites, in Heshbon, and in all the daughters thereof,' Numb. xxi. 21—25, for which we may allow another *month.* But here, again, as Sihon gathered *all* his people, one great defeat would put Israel in possession of the whole land. A few days would be sufficient to spread themselves over it. Let us, then, grant a fortnight (6). After that 'Moses sent to spy out Jaazer, and they took the villages thereof, and drove out the Amorites that were there,' Numb. xxi. 32, say, in another *fortnight.*" But, surely, if the main army had been defeated, and the capital and great cities taken, it would not require a fortnight to take a few villages. Moses wisely sent to reconnoitre — and it would seem that the reconnoitring party

were sufficient to drive out those who remained. For this a week is more than sufficient (7). D. C. says, "Then 'they turned up by the way of Bashan, and Og the king of Bashan went out against them, and they smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none of them left alive, and they possessed his land,' Numb. xxi. 33—35. For all this work of capturing threescore cities, fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, besides unwalled towns a great many (Deut. iii. 4, 5), we must allow at the very least a month." D. C. here uses the word "capturing," as if the Israelites had first to besiege, and then take these cities by storm. But of this there is not a hint in the text. On the contrary, it is said, "So the Lord our God delivered into our hands Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people: and we smote him until none was left to him remaining, and we took all his cities at that time." When the king and the army were thus utterly defeated, the fall of the cities and the possession of the land would follow as a matter of course. After the first decisive blow, a fortnight was more than enough; and thus D. C.'s six months are reduced to fifty-nine days, leaving four months for the rest of the history.

Here, as there is no note of time, we have opposed conjecture to conjecture, but with this difference, that our conjecture concerning the possible and probable rapidity of Israelite conquest is confirmed by historic facts within the

personal knowledge of many still living. What impetuous valour on the one hand, and stunning defeat on the other, can accomplish in a very few days, may be seen in the results of the battle of Jena, which, says the historian, "decided the fate of all the countries between the Rhine and the Elbe." The battle was fought on the 14th October, 1806, and "thirteen days after Napoleon entered Berlin. Two days after the battle, Erfurt, with a garrison of 8000 men, fell into the hands of the enemy. In seven days more the fortress of Spandau fell. A few days later the fortresses of Stettin and Küstrin, though well provided with garrisons and munitions of war, capitulated. On the 10th November, Kleist and Wartensleben, at the head of nineteen generals, surrendered the fortress of Magdeburg, the bulwark of the kingdom, with a garrison of from eighteen to twenty thousand men[s]," so that in four days less than a month the great and mighty kingdom of Prussia, and its fortresses, its more than "threescore cities fenced with walls, gates and bars, besides unwalled towns a great many,' with the whole country between the Rhine and the Elbe, were in the possession of the French. Is this unhistoric? Let D. C. now look at the maps of Palestine and Germany, compare the extent of country, the means and power of resistance and then calculate how much time these French

[s] Weber, Weltgeschichte, vol. ii. pp. 401, 402.

movements and conquests ought to have taken, and he will find the narrative far more incredible than what is related in the Book of Numbers. But will he dare to call it unhistoric? or, on the strength of his own calculations, ask us to give up our belief in the veracity of the historian? Many are still living who remember the astounding events, and know that the history is strictly and literally true.

As to the punishment inflicted on Midian, if the Pentateuch be true, and D. C. has not yet succeeded in convincing us that it is false, then the punishment was commanded by Him, of whom none but the Pentateuch ever told us before, that "He is merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth;" and all who believe the Pentateuch must regard the allusion to Cawnpore as simple blasphemy. In this matter, therefore, we leave the Bishop to God and his own conscience, only expressing our belief, that the Judge of all the earth can do no wrong; and, that whether He employ the pestilence or the earthquake, fire from heaven or the sword of man as His executioners, He is righteous in all His ways and holy in all His works.

Thus the examination of Bishop Colenso's objections has only proved that there is nothing in them to affect the historic character which the Pentateuch has hitherto enjoyed, and still

less to shake that faith in its Divine origin, which is common to the Jewish people and the whole Christian Church. There are only two difficulties which appear serious; the first of them has been solved by the undoubted fact that the expression, "going or coming down into Egypt," is, according to the author's usage, applicable to those born in that country; and by the equally certain fact, that the narrative makes Judah older than D. C. supposes him to be. The second difficulty, that of the sustentation of the cattle in the wilderness, is removed by the probable changes which may have occurred in the peninsula of Sinai since the days of Moses, and by the Scripture references to God's mercy in sending His people rain whilst in the wilderness. The other difficulties rest on doubtful premises, unwarranted assumptions, defective information, and even on what, in ordinary men, would be considered want of common sense. Those derived from the size of the Tabernacle and camp, and the priests' duties, if not urged in earnest by a man of education, would be pronounced silly; that from the small number of priests, and the amount of their duties, not much better. The difficulties found in the statement that all Israel was armed, or that so many lambs were to be killed in a very short space of time, are based upon D. C.'s own choice of the signification of words, concerning which no man living

can pronounce with certainty. Similar is the objection about the sprinkling of the blood at the second passover. Whether the blood was sprinkled or not is still a matter of controversy. D. C.'s objection rests simply on his asserting as a certainty that which is doubtful. That his authority is sufficient to turn the scale in matters of doubt, is not proved by the fact that his difficulties about the priest carrying the bullock, the Israelites dwelling in booths, and the institution and celebration of the passover on the same day, proceed from want of accurate acquaintance with the Hebrew language. The objections derived from the shekel of the Sanctuary and the poll-tax are made plausible only by omitting important words of the texts on which he founds the objections. The assertion that Joshua could not be heard when reading the Law, proceeds partly from want of a common-sense view of the narrative, mainly from ignorance of the locality where Joshua and the tribes stood. The difficulties about the night of the first passover, and the march out of Egypt, rest on the false assumption that the Israelites went out at a moment's notice, contrary to the whole tenour of the narrative. That with regard to the number of the firstborn is made out by taking the word *B'kor* in a sense not known in Scripture. The apparently grand difficulty, as to the number of the Israelites, Danites, and Levites, rests, firstly, upon the false assertion that all Israel went out

in the fourth generation; secondly, upon th unwarranted assumption that the sixty-nin progenitors of Israel had no children after the went down into Egypt, and the consequentl incorrect rate of increase adopted: that fro the war with Midian, from forgetfulness of wha has been effected in war in our own time. Such difficulties, resting on such slender foundations would not affect the historic character of an ancient writing, much less of that wonderfu Book, whose genuineness is attested by an un broken series of Hebrew writers, and avouche by the infallible testimony of the Son of God.

II. POSITIVE TESTIMONY.

Enough has been said to show that Bisho Colenso's objections do not destroy the histori character of the Pentateuch. But it is well t remember, that, independently of all solutions o difficulties, there is testimony sufficient to prov its genuineness and Divine origin. That testi mony is found in the books of the Old and Ne Testament. It is possible to trace the existenc of the Pentateuch in every age, from Malachi t Joshua: that is sufficient to prove its genuine ness. It has the sanction of the Saviour and Hi Apostles, and that will prove its Divine origin The question may, however, occur to some minds How do we know that the Pentateuch, which w now possess, is that referred to by our Lord, an

cited by Hebrew writers? To this the answer is, We have most satisfactory proof of the identity. The Pentateuch has descended to us in at least four independent channels. The whole people of the Jews, Rabbinists and Karaites; the Greek, Syrian, and Roman churches, all possess a Pentateuch. It stands at the beginning of their Sacred Scriptures. And those different copies,—the Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, Syriac, and Latin, all so wonderfully agree, as to leave no doubt of identity. The present Jews have received their Hebrew copies, and the Chaldee translations, from those who dwelt not only in Jerusalem, but in Babylon. The Pentateuch of Eastern, and Western, Indian, African, and Chinese Jews, is the same. The translation possessed by the Greeks is that received at the time of their conversion, and has come down in a perfectly distinct channel from the Hebrew. There was no love between Jews and Greeks, so as to induce the latter to conform their Scriptures to those of the former, and yet the Greek Pentateuch is manifestly a translation of the Hebrew possessed by the Jews. The Syriac version agrees still more minutely with the Hebrew; and yet the intercourse of Syrian Christians with Jews was as little as that of the Greeks. With regard to the Latin, there is the same agreement, and the same independence of transmission. Between Jews and Christians

there was a wall of separation which entirely prevented either from borrowing of the other. Amongst Christians themselves there were differences, both in language and theology, sufficient to prevent collusion. The Greek translation was not made from the Syriac; nor the Syriac from the Greek. They are entirely independent one of the other; and yet all present to us, with a few unimportant differences, the same Pentateuch. The Hebrew is that which the Jews received from their fathers. The Greek existed before the Incarnation of the Saviour. The Syriac version was made, as is generally supposed, early in the second century, probably before that time. We have, therefore, four independent witnesses to prove the identity of the Pentateuch which we possess, with that which was known to our Lord. And to these might be added the testimonies of Philo and Josephus, in whose writings sufficient portions of the Pentateuch are found to prove the identity of their copies with ours, and their belief that Moses was the author.

But, from the days of our Lord to the time of the last canonical Hebrew writer, there is a long interval. How can it be known, therefore, that the Pentateuch as then existing was that received from Malachi and his contemporaries? Here again there is a chain of sufficient testimonies. About one hundred and thirty years before

Christ, the grandson of Jesus, the son of Sirach, translated the book of Ecclesiasticus into Greek[9]. That book is acknowledged to be genuine, and has so many references to the Law as to prove the identity of the book so called. The first book of Maccabees, also received as authentic by modern critics, carries us nearly fifty years farther back. The mad efforts of Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy the book of the Law; and the zeal, not only of the priests, but of the common people, ready to die rather than disobey it, attest the existence of the book, and the popular belief that it was from God. That our Pentateuch existed, and was received as the Law of Moses, one hundred years earlier, that is, about two hundred and eighty years before Christ, is attested by the fact that it was then translated into Greek by Alexandrian Jews. Their version, commonly known as the Septuagint, is that quoted by Evangelists and Apostles, and handed down to us by the Greek Fathers; and of whose agreement with the Hebrew we have already spoken. The Providence of God has preserved a still more ancient testimony, in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Its existence was known to the Christian Fathers; but for a thousand years it lay concealed, and at last came forth as from the

[9] See Hody, De bibliorum textibus originalibus, pp. 192, 193. Jahn's Introduction, Part ii. § 249. De Wette, Einleitung, Bleek, &c.

grave, to assure us of the identity of the Pentateuch. Suppose that in that long interval some doubter had said, The Samaritans were a distinct and rival sect, hated by the Jews, and hating in return. Josephus, and the Fathers of the Church, and the Rabbis, all bear witness that they had a copy of the Pentateuch: bring it forth, and let us compare it with the Hebrew and Christian copies, and see whether they agree. How would he have triumphed had the Samaritan copy been produced, and found to differ altogether from those of Jews and Christians! But what is the fact? The Samaritan copy has been produced, written in a character equally unknown to Jews and Christians. A little remnant of the people still exist to present it to the world. And, lo! with the exception of a very few passages, it is the same in narrative and legislative enactment as that known to the Synagogue and the Church. This testimony carries us back to the erection of the Temple on Mount Gerizim, to the days of Sanballat, that is, to the time of Nehemiah[1], and the close of the canon of the Old Testament; and assures us not only that it existed, but that it was not and could not be a compilation of those times. Manasseh, of the family of the high priest, being excluded from the priesthood because he refused

[1] Neh. xiii. 28.

to dismiss his heathen wife as the Law required, does not protest against this Law as ungenuine, and therefore unworthy of obedience; but, when he leaves the Jewish people, imposes its yoke upon his Samaritan friends. Such conduct can only be explained by Manasseh's firm conviction that its origin was Divine. Its acceptance by the Samaritans testifies a similar conviction on their part, produced by what they had already learned. At all events, the Pentateuch then existed, was ever afterwards preserved by the Samaritans, and their copy now shows the identity of their Pentateuch with our own[2].

EZRA, NEHEMIAH, AND THE LATER PROPHETS.

Thus without having recourse to the Sacred Records, we have traced the existence of the Pentateuch to the time of the return from Babylon. From this time on we have the testimony

[2] I have here followed Prideaux (vol. i. p. 396, &c.), in his view of the history of Sanballat, and the Samaritan adoption of the Pentateuch. Since then a similar view has been defended by Hengstenberg, "Authentie des Pentateuches," vol. i. pp. 1—48; also by Bleek, Einleitung, pp. 332—337. Dr. S. Davidson, in his "Treatise on Biblical Criticism," vol. i. pp. 97, 98, thinks that the Samaritans received the Law in the time of Josiah, which is, of course, more favourable to the present argument. Indeed, on page 95, he asserts, "That it [the Pentateuch] was in the Kingdom of the ten tribes and obtained legal authority, must be taken as certain."

of Hebrew writers. Of these, during the rebuilding of the Temple and City of Jerusalem, and the restoration of the Hebrew commonwealth, there are no less than five, Malachi, Haggai, Zechariah, Nehemiah, and Ezra. With the two last-named writers, modern criticism has dealt unceremoniously. But the unsparingness of the criticism has done more good than harm. The most sceptical admit enough to be genuine, to prove that the Law existed, and was received as the Law of God given by Moses. These books describe the endeavour of the leaders of the Jews to restore the Temple and the worship as they had been before the captivity, and the Law of Moses is the norm according to which all was to be done. Ezra (vii. 21) speaks of "the Law of the God of heaven." Nehemiah (i. 7) confesses the transgression "of the commandments, statutes, and judgments, which God commanded Moses." Malachi (iv. 4) commands Israel "to remember the law of Moses given in Horeb with the statutes and judgments." Haggai says "Ask now the priests concerning the law." Zechariah testifies against Israel, that "they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the Law." Now the Law here spoken of must be that known to Manasseh and the Samaritans, and therefore identical with that which we now possess. It was evidently not written or compiled at the time. The tithes and

sacrifices were burdensome under the circumstances of the returned Jews; the laws with respect to marriage more burdensome still. Nothing but faith in the Law, as received from their fathers, could have led the people to submit, or the leaders to persevere in the trying and ungrateful task of restoring the ancient worship and discipline. Indeed, it is admitted on all hands that the Law spoken of, or alluded to in these books, is the Pentateuch in all its completeness as we now possess it. The Jews must therefore have possessed it in their exile, and brought it back with them on their return.

EZEKIEL.

The correctness of this statement is abundantly proved by the writings of Ezekiel, who was himself a captive. He had been carried away eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem, began to prophesy in the fifth year of the captivity, and continued to prophesy at least until the sixteenth year after the city had been destroyed [3]. Concerning the genuineness of these writings modern criticism raises no doubts. Its estimate of Ezekiel's style and genius is not very flattering, but it pronounces that the prominent and unequivocal peculiarities of the man are stamped on every page from the beginning to the end; that the book was written, and its parts arranged in their

[3] Ezek. i. 1, 2, and xxix. 17.

present order by Ezekiel himself[4]. If, therefore, he was acquainted with the Pentateuch, or Law, it must be that which Ezra and his companions brought with them from their exile, even if we had no details to prove their identity. That he was thus acquainted with a law, judgments, and statutes, acknowledged by the people as divine, to which therefore he could refer in order to convince them of sin, and on which, as upon an infallible authority, he could found his reproofs, is certain beyond the shadow of a doubt. In chapter xxii. 26, Ezekiel says, "The priests have done violence to my law." That in this passage the Prophet does not use the word "Law," generally, of any religious doctrine given by God, but of "The Law," is evident from the detail which precedes and follows the words quoted. In verses 3—12 we read, "In thee have they set light by father and mother: in the midst of thee have they dealt by oppression with the stranger: in thee have they vexed the fatherless and the widow. Thou hast despised my holy things, and hast profaned my sabbaths. In thee are men that carry tales to shed blood, and in thee they eat upon the mountains: in thee have they discovered their fathers' nakedness. In thee

[4] See De Wette, Einleitung, § 221—224. Gesenius, Geschichte, p. 35. Bleek, Einleitung, p. 515. Ullman, Comm. p. vii. Compare Carpzov, Introd. part iii. p. 205. And John Henry Michaelis' Preface to Ezekiel, sect. 14.

have they humbled her that was set apart for pollution. And one hath committed abomination with his neighbour's wife; and another hath lewdly defiled his daughter-in-law, and another in thee hath humbled his sister, his father's daughter. In thee have they taken gifts to shed blood. Thou hast taken usury and increase." In these few verses there are at least twenty-nine references to, or rather quotations from the Pentateuch, from Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, perceptible in the English version, but the very Hebrew words used in the original of those books [5]. In the twenty-sixth verse, first referred to, we read, "Their priests have done violence to my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." In this one verse are at least four more references, to Lev. x. 10, xi. 45, xx. 25, and Exod. xxxi. 13. Besides which, it is to be remarked that the word translated *profane* (חל) occurs only in the Pentateuch, in 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6, and in Ezekiel. Let the reader also examine chapters xviii. and xx., where he will find references and quotations without end. The latter chapter is also worthy of attention as a recapitulation of the history of what happened in the

[5] Let the reader turn out the marginal references in any ordinary edition of the Bible.

wilderness. Indeed the whole book of Ezekiel is impregnated with the language of the Pentateuch, as has been proved long ago. It is specially remarkable for the use of the figures and language peculiar to the Pentateuch. Thus, the phrase, "Pine[6] away in their iniquity," Ezek. iv. 17, xxiv. 23, xxxiii. 10, occurs only here and Lev. xxvi. 39. Again, a favourite expression of Ezekiel's, "Mine eyes shall not spare," Ezek. v. 11, vii. 4. 9, viii. 18, ix. 5. 10, occurs in the Pentateuch, once in Gen. xlv. 20 (margin), five times in Deuteronomy, and only once besides in the whole Bible, Isa. xiii. 18. Another phrase peculiar to Ezekiel and the Pentateuch is, "I will draw out a sword after them." Compare Exod. xv. 9, Lev. xxvi. 33, with Ezekiel v. 2. 12, xii. 14, and observe in Lev. xxvi. 33, and Ezek. xii. 14, that the threat of drawing the sword is in both cases accompanied with "the threat of dispersion," expressed in the original in the very same words. Again, the phrase "Staff of bread[7]," occurring in our Prophet, iv. 16, v. 16, xiv. 12, is found only in the Pentateuch, Lev. xxvi. 26. In like manner, the expression "I will set my face," employed several times by Ezekiel, is, excepting two passages in Jeremiah, found only in the Pentateuch. There are many other similar points of agreement, but these are sufficient to identify the Law of which Ezekiel speaks with the Penta-

[6] נמקו בעונם.

[7] מטה לחם, not משען, as in Isa. iii.

teuch which we now possess. And it is particularly to be observed, that his references to the Law necessarily imply that the Priests, the Prophets, and the people all knew the law to which he referred, and received it as an undoubtedly Divine authority, to which they were amenable, by which they were to be judged, and from which there was no appeal. We have, therefore, unexceptionable testimony that the Pentateuch existed in the captivity, and seven years before the destruction of Jerusalem.

JEREMIAH.

The testimony of Ezekiel is overlapped by that of Jeremiah, who was partly his contemporary and partly his predecessor, whose writings also, with a few exceptions to which it is not necessary now to refer, have stood the test of modern criticism. If Jeremiah knew a Divine law, it must be that known to Ezekiel, and therefore that known to us. That a law was known to him is certain. He mentions it expressly, and often quotes it. Thus, in ix. 13 (12), the Lord says, "They have forsaken my law which I set before them;" and, xvi. 11, "They have not kept my law;" and, vi. 19, "They have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but have rejected it;" and again, xxxii. 22, the prophet says, "They have not obeyed thy voice, neither walked in thy law." But some will perhaps say, as some have said, that of course the law was known to

Jeremiah, as in his days the Book of the Law is said to have been found in the Temple; but that, before that book was found, it was unknown, and therefore fabricated by Hilkiah and his fellow-priests, and imposed upon Josiah. The reasoning upon which former sceptics arrived at this conclusion is absurd. They argue thus: A book was found, or pretended to be found, by the priest, who said, "I have found the Book of the Law," which never existed, and of course was unknown to the king and the people; and yet, though utterly unknown, it was instantly received by the king and all the people without suspicion or inquiry, and all submitted to the extirpation of the idolatries then practised, and to the burdens which it imposed; and, according to this unknown book, reformed Church and State, and although they had never before heard of its enactments, believed that it had been observed by their fathers from the days of Moses. This is plainly impossible. That the king and the court, and many of the people, might have been, and probably were, ignorant of the contents of the law is highly probable. The two preceding reigns had been decidedly hostile to true religion. Manasseh was both a seducer and a persecutor. "He seduced them to do more evil than did the nations whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel." He reared up altars for Baal and Asherah, and worshipped all the host of heaven in the courts of the Lord's

house, and filled Jerusalem with innocent blood. Amon, his successor, walked in all the ways that his father walked in, and served the idols that his father served; and these kings were followed by priests, prophets, and people, as we find Jeremiah complaining, "The priests said not, Where is the Lord? . . . The pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal. . . . . The house of Israel is ashamed: they, their kings, their princes, their prophets, saying to a stock, Thou art my father, and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth" (Jer. ii. 8. 26). Even of Jerusalem itself he says, "There is not one that seeketh the truth" (v. 1). No wonder, then, that they permitted the Temple to go to ruin, and the copy of the Law, belonging to it—perhaps the very autograph of Moses—to be lost. No wonder, if Josiah, with such a father and grandfather, such priests and such a court, had been ignorant of the denunciations of the Law. Hilkiah, on the contrary, was not astonished. He says, "I have found the Book of the Law." He knew, therefore, that there was such a book, and says, "I have found it:" as Thenius, who is certainly no believer in inspiration, says, in his Commentary, "The expression, the *Book of the Law*, shows plainly that the question here is not about something that came to light for the first time, but something that was already

known[8]." It is true that this commentator does not believe that the book found was our present Pentateuch, but he believes that what was found was not something new, or something never heard of before, but a written law, previously known. He believes that such a written law had existed, just as Hitzig asserts in his Commentary on Jeremiah (p. 60), that a written law had always existed in Judah. But as the Law known to Ezekiel was our present Pentateuch, that known to Jeremiah, partly his contemporary, cannot be different. That it was known to Jeremiah before the finding of the book can be proved by his prophecies delivered at the beginning of his ministry. He began to prophesy in the thirteenth year of Josiah. The Book of the Law was not found until the eighteenth year of that king. Now even Hitzig admits that chapters ii. 1—viii. 17 were written before the eighteenth year, and the second chapter probably in the thirteenth year of Josiah that is, the first of Jeremiah's ministry[9]. Both testify the existence of the Law. In Jer. ii. 8 it is said, "They that handle the law (תפשי התורה) know me not;" and in viii. 8, "How say ye, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with

[8] Comment on 2 Kings xxii. 8.

[9] See Hitzig, in loc. Compare also Bleek, Einleitung p. 472.

us ?" Before the finding of the book, therefore, "The Law" existed, and was called "The Law of the Lord." These chapters also contain references and quotations which serve to identify it with the present Pentateuch. Thus, chap. ii. 6: "Neither said they, Where is the Lord that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, that led us through the wilderness, through a land of deserts and of pits, through a land of drought, and of the shadow of death, through a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt? And I brought you into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit thereof and the goodness thereof: but when ye entered ye defiled my land, and made mine heritage an abomination." Here are allusions, either in sense or word, or both, to Deut. viii. 15; Numb. xiv. 7, 8; Lev. xviii. 25—28; Numb. xxxv. 33, 34. In ver. 28 the prophet says, "Where are thy gods, that thou hast made thee? let them arise if they can save thee in the time of trouble," evidently a quotation of Deut. xxxii. 37, 38. Chapter iii. 1 is an undoubted reference to Deut. xxiv. 3, 4. Chapter iii. 16 refers to a number of places in the Pentateuch, and the chief features in the Mosaic worship: "In those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord; neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it, neither shall that be done any more." This tells us that there was a covenant.

Exod. xxiv. 7, 8; Deut. v. 2, 3, that there was an "ark of the covenant of the Lord,"—the very words found Numb. x. 33, and Deut. xxxi. 26, that the Israelites used to visit it—words to be explained only by the commands, to go up three times in the year, Exod. xxiii. 17; Deut. xvi. 16. In the days of Jeremiah, before the finding of the book, therefore, the whole history of the covenant, that is, in fact, of the giving of the laws, all the directions about the ark, the three great feasts, is presupposed, and, without the existence of the Pentateuch, would be unintelligible. Chap. iv. 4 "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord," is a quotation from Deut. x. 16, and an allusion to Deut. xxx. 6, and contains a figure found in no other sacred writer. Chap. v. 15, "Lo, I will bring a nation upon you from far, O house of Israel, saith the Lord God . . . . a nation whose language thou knowest not, neither understandest what they say," is a quotation from Deut. xxviii. 49, and ver. 17, "they shall eat up their harvest," &c. from Lev. xxvi. 16, and Deut. xxviii. 31. Again, in chap. vii. 6, "Oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt: then will I cause you to dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers," are unmistakable allusions to Exod. xxii. 21; Deut. xix. 10, vi. 14, 15, iv. 10; Gen. xv. 18, xvii. 8, xxvi. 3, &c. The prophecies written subsequently to the finding of the book also contain numerous un-

doubted allusions to, or quotations from the Pentateuch; but those written before that time prove abundantly that Jeremiah, like Ezekiel, was well acquainted with the letter and the spirit of that law, which we now know as the Pentateuch. There can, therefore, be no doubt, that "The Law" of which he speaks as the Law of the Lord, existing at the same time as that known to Ezekiel, must be identical with it, and also with "The Book of the Law" found in the Temple. And thus the existence of the Pentateuch from the days of our Lord to the thirteenth year of Josiah is firmly established. But it was not then invented nor written for the first time: it was not any thing new. Jeremiah had known it from his youth, for he was called at an early age. The people knew of it as well as the prophet; and therefore it could not have been invented any very short time preceding that in which Jeremiah began to prophesy. Neither could it have been invented in the days of Amon or Manasseh. Theirs were not days for trying to introduce a new religious system of laws, of which the great object was to extirpate idolatry. And therefore we must pursue our inquiry to the time of Hezekiah.

ISAIAH, MICAH, AMOS, HOSEA.

As "the Book of the Law" existed at the beginning of Josiah's reign, and could not

have been forged in the days of Amon or Manasseh, it must have existed in the time of Hezekiah. But it is not necessary to depend on inference in this matter. There are four unimpeachable witnesses of the fact, the prophets Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea, who bring us back beyond the days of Hezekiah to those of Uzziah and Jeroboam the Second. Three of these expressly mention "The Law of the Lord." Two testify that it was written in a book. All cite the contents of that book sufficiently to identify it with that which we possess. Thus in Isaiah v. 24, we read, "They have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts;" and again, xxx. 9, "Children that will not hear the law of the Lord." Amos says, ii. 4, "They have despised the law of the Lord." Hos. iv. 6, "Seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children;" and again, viii. 1, "They have transgressed my covenant, and trespassed against my law." These passages prove that there was a law well known to the people, acknowledged as the Law of God, which it was a sin to transgress; and, as appears from the last passage, obligatory in the nature of a covenant. The title, also, appears to have been in these days, "The Law of the Lord," as in Jeremiah viii. 8. That it was written is testified by Hosea viii. 12, "I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted

as a strange thing." And therefore Isaiah speaks of it as "The Book," just as we speak of the Bible. In chap. xxix. 18, it is said, "In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book," which even Gesenius interprets of the Law. His commentary on this verse is worth transcribing. "The *deaf* and the *blind* are the hardened and blinded free-thinkers (mentioned verse 9), who shall then leave the darkness in which they had been sitting, and turn to the *light* of the Law (comp. ii. 5). *Sepher*, סֵפֶר, The *Book*, by pre-eminence, is the Book of the Law, like 'the roll of the Book,' Ps. xl. 8, and Books,' סְפָרִים, Dan. ix. 2, the Holy Scriptures τὰ γραφαί. The Arabs also use the expression, The Book,' *Al kitabu*, pre-eminently of the Koran, though sometimes of the Holy Scripture of the Jews and Christians." There could have been only one Book of the Law called "The Book;" and, therefore, this Book, mentioned by Isaiah as so well known as to require no further description, must be identical with "the Book of the Law," found in the time of Josiah. But, as we have shown that that Book was our present Pentateuch, it follows that the Pentateuch existed in the days of Hezekiah; indeed, the words of Hosea viii. 12, show that it was known in the days of Uzziah and Jeroboam the Second. Even if these prophets had quoted nothing from "The Book," the identity stands fast; but they have

references amply sufficient to satisfy all impartia
minds, that they were well acquainted with th
Pentateuch as known to us. In the first place
they are acquainted with the history. They know
of the sin of Adam. "Like Adam[1], they have trans
gressed the covenant" (Hos. vi. 7): they know o
the sentence on the serpent. "They shall lick th
dust like the serpent[2] (כַּנָּחָשׁ), they shall move ou
of their holes like creeping things of the earth,'
Mic. vii. 17. But we have here, not only a referenc
to Gen. iii. 14, but a quotation of certain word
found Deut. xxxii. 24. The Hebrew word fo
creeping things (זֹחֲלֵי) occurs only here, i
Deut. and in Job xxxii. 6. The references t
Sodom and Gomorrah are frequent, Isa. i. 9, 10
iii. 9. Amos iv. 11, and Hos. xi. 8. The promise
to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are also referre
to, Micah vii. 20. Hosea refers to the history o
Jacob. "He took his brother by the heel in th
womb, and by his strength he had power wit
God: yea, he had power over the angel and pre
vailed, he wept and made supplication unto him
He found him in Bethel." Here are thre
allusions to Gen. xxv. 26; Gen. xxxii. 24; an
xxviii. 11. Perhaps also to xxxi. 11. The bring

[1] "Not 'like men,' but 'like Adam,' as in Job xxxi. 3
Adam actually did both things imputed to him in thes
passages." Hitzig, Comment. in loc.

[2] Here also Hitzig acknowledges the reference to Ge
iii. 14.

ing up out of Egypt, and the wandering in the wilderness, are spoken of in the very language of the Pentateuch, as Micah vi. 4, "I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam." Comp. vii. 15. Hosea (ii. 15) says, "She shall sing there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of Egypt," referring both to the Exodus, and to the song of Moses and Miriam. And again, xi. 1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt:" alluding particularly to the language of Exod. iv. 22, 23, "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, my firstborn: and I say unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me." Amos (ii. 10) says, "Also I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and led you forty years through the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite." Besides the Exodus, and sojourn in the wilderness, there is also a reference to Gen. xv. 16. Compare also Amos iii. 1, and v. 25. Micah (vi. 5) refers to the history of Balaam.

These prophets also show an accurate acquaintance with particular precepts. Thus, when Isaiah says, "I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts: and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of the goats;" in the original, the names of the

animals are all masculine, because, according to the Mosaic Law, the males alone were lawful for burnt-offerings. In the next verse, "When ye come to appear before me," he uses the language of Exod. xxxiv. 24, respecting the three great feasts. In the thirteenth verse, "Bring no more vain meat-offerings: incense is an abomination to me: the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with. It is iniquity, even the solemn day of assembly," Isaiah not only refers to several Mosaic precepts, but shows the same exact knowledge. Thus, he puts meat-offering together with incense, because for the former the latter was required. See Lev. ii. 1. 16, and vi. 14, 15. And, next to new moons and sabbaths, he mentions calling of assemblies or holy convocations, because these convocations were held at those times, as well as on the great feasts: see the whole of the 23rd chapter of Leviticus. And along with these holy convocations, he speaks of what is translated "solemn assembly;" but means particularly the seventh day of the feast of Passover, and the eighth of that of Tabernacles. See Lev. xxiii. 36. Numb xxix. 35. Deut. xvi. 8. Again, in chap. ii. 7 Isaiah complains, "Their land is full of horses neither is there any end of their chariots:" and in xxxi. 1, pronounces a woe against them "that go down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses and trust in chariots because they are many, and

in horsemen because they are strong." Without the Pentateuch, it would be difficult to explain the sin of having horses and chariots. Deut. xvii. 16 tells us, that to have them, or to send down to fetch them, was forbidden by the Lord. Isa. iii. 14, "Ye have eaten up the vineyard," is an allusion to Exod. xxii. 5, "If a man shall cause a field or vineyard to be eaten, and shall put in his own beast, and shall feed in another man's field; of the best of his own field, and of his own vineyard, shall he make restitution." The Hebrew word for *eat* (בער) is peculiar, and the same in both places, so as to leave no doubt of the allusion. In chapter v. 26, the prophet says, "He will lift up an ensign to the nations from far, and will hiss unto them from the end of the earth, and, behold, they shall come with speed swiftly." This is a citation from Deut. xxviii. 49, where it is said, "The Lord shall lift up (ישא) *a nation* against thee from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth;" at the same time, Isaiah shows that he is the later writer by the alteration of the words, "He shall lift up a nation," into "He shall lift up an ensign." The latter part of the verse in Deuteronomy, "A nation, whose language thou shalt not understand," is here omitted by the prophet, but it is referred to elsewhere, Isa. xxviii. 11, and xxxiii. 19. Again, in chapter xxx. 16, 17, there is a verbal citation of two

passages of the Law—"But ye said, No; but we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee: and we will ride upon the swift; therefore shall they be swift that pursue you. One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one; at the rebuke of five shall ye flee." Exact parallels are found in Lev. xxvi. 8, "Five of you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight;" and in the threat, verse 17, "Ye shall flee when none pursueth you." Compare also Deut. xxxii. 30. The reader will easily find many more. But we must hasten on to the other prophets. In chapter ix. 3 &c., Hosea refers to a number of the Mosaic commandments, "They shall eat unclean things in Assyria. They shall not offer wine-offerings unto the Lord, neither shall they be pleasing to Him: their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners; all that eat thereof shall be polluted: for their bread for their soul shall not come into the house of the Lord. What will ye do in the day of the appointed assembly (מועד), and in the day of the feast of the Lord?" And again, xii. 9 (10), "I will yet make thee dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the appointed feast" (מועד), not "feasts" as in some English Bibles. In like manner Amos says (viii. 10) "I will turn your periodical feasts (חגיכם) into mourning." The Hebrew word is used especially of the Passover, Exod. xxxiv. 25; and of the

feast of Tabernacles, Lev. xxiii. 34. He uses the same word, chap. v. 21, and couples with it that peculiar word, which we have translated above, "day of the solemn assembly." The new moons and sabbaths are also mentioned, Hosea ii. 11 (13), and Amos viii. 5. In Amos iv. 4, 5, there is one short passage which shows an intimate acquaintance with many of the Levitic laws. It is this, "Come to Bethel and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression: and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes after three years, and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the freewill-offerings." Now here is, in the first place, an allusion to the continual burnt-offering, Numb. xxviii.; in the second place, to the tithe to be laid up at the end of three years, Deut. xiv. 28, and xxvi. 13; in the third place, to the thank-offering, in which sacrifice alone, leavened bread is permitted. In Lev. ii. 11 it is expressly said, "No meat-offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall be made with leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey in the offering of the Lord made by fire." But, with regard to the thanksgiving-offering, an exception is made. First, it is said, Lev. vii. 12, "If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then shall he offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and un-

leavened wafers." But then it is added, "Besides the cakes, he shall offer for his offering *leavened* bread, with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace-offerings." In the fourth place, the prophet speaks of the freewill-offering, mentioned Lev. xxii. 18—21, and Deut. xii. 6, so that the accuracy of agreement in this one passage, goes far towards proving that the law of which Amos speaks is identical with that which we now possess. In Amos ii. 11, 12, he speaks of the Nazarites in conformity with the command Numb. vi. In iii. 14 he mentions "the horns of the altar," commanded to be made, Exod. xxvii. 2. Amos threatens, "The horns of the altar shall be cut off and fall to the ground." But how is this a threat? What damage was likely to ensue because the ornaments of the altar were removed? To understand this, it is necessary to remember, that, according to the Mosaic law, in order to effect an atonement for individuals or for the nation, it was necessary that the blood of the sacrifice should be put on the horns of the altar, as we find Lev. iv. 7, "The priest shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense before the Lord, which is in the tabernacle of the congregation:" and again, Exod. xxx. 10, "Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it once in a year, with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement.

Once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations." This one threat presupposes, that the people threatened were well acquainted with these ordinances, and valued them so highly as to think deprivation a punishment.

These references may suffice to convince us that as these prophets are acquainted with the Law of the Lord, a written law, called "The Book," and at the same time refer to the history and ordinances—to the periodic feasts generally, and the feast of tabernacles specially—to the new moons and sabbaths, to the accurate distinction of the sacrifices, into burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and thank-offerings—the nature of the animals required—the tithes—the distinction of clean and unclean food—the Nazarites—the construction of the altar, the mode of atonement, &c. &c., and all this in the language of our present Pentateuch, the law of which they speak is the same as that known to us, even if there were no other records in the world but the Pentateuch and the writings of these prophets. But when we remember that the Pentateuch has been traced up to the days of Hezekiah, when these prophets exercised their ministry—and that, besides, there are historic books recording such a state of things as the Pentateuch must necessarily have produced, we can entertain no doubt as to the existence of that book in the days of these prophets, that is, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Heze-

kiah, kings of Judah, and Jeroboam, king of Israel [3].

A book received in the days of those kings, and by such men as these four prophets, so intimately acquainted with the history of their people, so bold in contending against error and sin, and so zealous for the truth, could not have been a forgery of their own days, nor of those immediately preceding. It must have been received of old as the law of the Lord. Indeed, the fact that in their days, and long before, there were two rival kingdoms, two rival priesthoods, and two different systems of worship, makes it impossible that any new system of law could have been imposed by either of the kingdoms on the other. The priests in Bethel were not likely to receive a new law branding themselves as impostors, and their worship as idolatry, nor were the kings of Israel more inclined to acknowledge a law, which, if firmly believed, must put an end to their royalty. As, therefore, the Pentateuch existed in the days of Uzziah and Jeroboam II., and could not have arisen during any period of the schism, it must also have existed in the days of Rehoboam and Solomon. And this conclusion

[3] The Book of Joel would bring us to the days of Joash, king of Judah. But as there is much difference of opinion as to the time in which he prophesied, and as the four prophets bring us to the times of the kingdom of Israel, it is unnecessary to adduce his evidence.

is confirmed by the historical books [4]. A state of things is there described, just such as would have arisen from the knowledge of the Pentateuch, and allusions are made to certain portions of that book.

BOOKS OF KINGS.

In the kingdom of Judah, to which the whole body of the Levites gave in their adhesion, distinct traces of the Pentateuch may be found. In 2 Kings xiv. 6, it is related that Amaziah slew the murderers of his father, but the children of the murderers he slew not. The historian adds, "according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, or the children for the fathers." But if the historian had omitted this

[4] Though German critics reject all that is supernatural in the historical books, and deny the authenticity of some passages of the narrative, they do not deny their general credibility. Thus Thenius says, concerning the Books of Kings, "The sections in the preceding paragraph under the fabric A. II., as belonging to an extract from *the history* of the Kings, possess the fullest claim to credibility. Those referred to in A. I., have a very slight tincture of the legendary . . . . But by far the greatest portion of the contents admit no doubts as to their historic character. Even those sections enumerated under B. I. and II. are certainly not devoid of an historic basis, and we have no reason whatever to doubt the truth of that which is remarked by the redactor himself." Introduction to his Commentary to the Book of Kings, p. viii.

reference, and only stated the fact, every attentive reader would have thought of Deut. xxiv. 16, especially as Amaziah was a pious king, "who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord." In the reign of Joash there are several obvious allusions to the Pentateuch. Thus 2 Kings xii. 16, "The trespass-money and sin-money was not brought into the house of the Lord: it was the priests'," is in conformity with the laws in Lev. v. 15, 16, vii. 7; Numb. v. 18. Again, in ver. 4 we read, "And Joash said to the priests, All the money of the dedicated things that is brought into the house of the Lord, even the money of every one that *passeth the account*, the soul-money of his valuation, all the money that cometh into any man's heart to bring into the house of the Lord, let the priests take it unto them." Here are three sorts of money reckoned; first, "that of him *who passeth*"—our translators have put in "the account." The language is that of Exod. xxx. 13, "Every one that passeth among them that are numbered;" the money is the half-shekel. As here for the Temple so in Exodus this money was destined for the tabernacle of the congregation. Secondly, the money at which the persons, or souls, were valued, Lev. xxvii. 2—8, "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When a man shall make a singular vow, the person [*Heb.* souls] shall be for the Lord by thy estimation;" and, thirdly, the freewill-money

Without the Pentateuch this verse would be unintelligible. Again, in describing the elevation of Joash to his kingdom, it is said, "And he brought forth the king's son, and put the crown upon him, and the testimony." The word *testimony* here means "the Law," as Thenius says, "*The Law*, a book in which the Mosaic ordinances were written. After the king had been adorned with the diadem, this was held over his head in a symbolical manner." In this sense the word *testimony* occurs Ps. xix. 7 (8), where it is parallel to *Torah*, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple;" on which words Hupfeld thus comments: "*Testimony*, common expression in the Pentateuch for the Mosaic Law, properly *a testimony*, inasmuch as it testifies the will of God, especially against sin." Thus a Book of the Law existed in the time of Joash; and as it also existed in the days of Uzziah, as we have already proved, it must have been identical with it, that is, it must be identical with our present Pentateuch. About thirty years before, we find this book also mentioned. In 2 Chron. xvii. 7—9, we are told that Jehoshaphat sent five princes, nine Levites, and two priests to perambulate the cities of Judah, and teach the people, and they had the Book of the Law of the Lord with them. We have just seen that Thenius admits that

there was such a book. Bertheau makes a similar admission here. He says, in his Commentary on the place, "*The Book of the Law of the Lord* was probably, in the opinion of the historian, our present Pentateuch. But if this book did not exist in the time of Jehoshaphat in its present form, there did certainly exist a collection of Mosaic laws; and it is possible that to make them known to the people was the task to be executed by those whom Jehoshaphat sent forth[5]." But, as there was a collection of Mosaic laws in the days of Joash, only thirty years distant from this time, it is highly improbable that it was different from that which had been taught to the people by the command of Jehoshaphat. That book which existed in the days of Jehoshaphat, must have existed before. It could not have been new. It could not have been fabricated in the days of Ahaziah or Jehoram, and must, therefore, have existed in the days of Asa; and accordingly we read, 2 Chron. xv. 12, 13, that in the reign of Asa, Judah and Benjamin and many out of the other tribes, "entered into *the* covenant (בַּבְּרִית), to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul, that whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel should be put to death." Now the idea of the nation entering into cove

[5] Comment. in loc.

nant with God is plainly taken from the Pentateuch. But here it is said, not merely that they entered into a covenant, but, as the Hebrew has it, into *the* covenant; and the great features of the covenant are described, "to seek to the Lord God of Israel," and "to put to death those who would not." A known covenant must, therefore, have existed between God and the people. That covenant is described Exod. xxiv. and Deut. xxix., and the substance of the covenant thus described is the same as that here recorded. The beginning of the words of the covenant in Exodus is the first commandment, requiring Israel to worship God and none else. And amongst the words of the covenant, Exod. xxii. 20, is found the same sanction, "He that sacrificeth unto any god, save the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed." That described in Deut. xxix. is precisely similar. They entered into covenant to have the Lord for their God, and to renounce all other gods, verses 12—21. In the description of Asa's zeal, the historian describes in some places in the very words of the Pentateuch that which the Pentateuch requires: "to seek the Lord God of their fathers, and to do the law (התורה) and the commandment." Asa brings us to the time of Jeroboam, the setter-up of the new kingdom and the new worship that existed in Israel from the days of the separation to the times of Hosea and Amos; and in

all its institutions Jeroboam paid an involuntary homage to the Pentateuch. The object of worship was the golden calf, which the Pentateuch tells us was loved by the Israelites in the wilderness. The worship itself was inaugurated by the king in the very words used by Aaron on a similar occasion:—"Behold thy gods, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." The chief place of worship, "the king's sanctuary," was at Bethel, consecrated as "the house of God," by Jacob's vision and his vow. The priests were of the lowest of the people; as the Levites, living amongst the ten tribes, remained faithful to the ancient worship of the law. The great feast was an imitation of the Feast of Tabernacles; and the reason for its appointment, lest the people should go up to Jerusalem, as the law required: so that every circumstance of the new religion of Jeroboam is a reference to the Pentateuch. Even the king's residences at Shechem and Penuel have their reminiscences of the law. Thus, in all his arrangements he appears to have had the history and ordinances of the Pentateuch before his eyes. Jeroboam brings us to the time of Solomon, and Solomon to that of David; and here the allusions to the Pentateuch are so many that a small selection must suffice. In 1 Kings ii. 28 it is related that Joab fled unto the Tabernacle of the Lord, and caught hold on the horns of

the altar: an unmistakable allusion to the construction of the altar, as commanded in the Law. On the horns also the blood was put, in order to procure forgiveness of God. Joab hoped, therefore, that his hold on these might procure him pardon from man. But the law, Exod. xxi. 14, commanded that the murderer should be taken even from the altar and slain; and, therefore, he was not pardoned. The expression, "Tabernacle of the Lord," is also remarkable, and shows the great reverence for that which was Mosaic. The Tabernacle at Jerusalem was that which David had erected as the receptacle for the Ark of the Covenant, when he brought it up to Zion. It is, therefore, not called "the Tabernacle of the Congregation," which was elsewhere. Though erected by a great and pious king, it did not obtain the title belonging to the original Tabernacle. In chapter iii. 4, we read that Solomon went to Gibeon to sacrifice; and, verse 15, that he sacrificed at Jerusalem. But even this apparent irregularity shows a reverence for that which was Mosaic. The Tabernacle of the Congregation, and the altar of burnt sacrifice, were at Gibeon (1 Chron. xvi. 1—37; 2 Chron. i. 3—5). The Ark of the Covenant was in the new Tabernacle on Zion. Therefore, sacrifice was offered in both places. In the description of the Temple of Solomon we find all conformable to the original

commands respecting the construction of the Tabernacle: the Holy of Holies, and the holy place, and the court, and the altars, and the golden candlestick, and the shewbread, and the Priests, and the Levites, at their respective duties. All was evidently arranged with the precepts of the Pentateuch before the eyes of the king and the priests, so that it is impossible to compare the two accounts in the Book of Kings and in the Pentateuch without coming to the conviction that the precepts of the latter were the same for the construction of the Temple.

But Solomon was an author, and some of his writings have been preserved; and in those universally received as genuine there are plain references to our Pentateuch. Thus, in Prov. xiii. 13, "Whoso despiseth the *word* shall be destroyed, but he that feareth the *commandment* shall be rewarded." Here "the word" is parallel to "the commandment," and proves that Solomon knew of a divinely-revealed law, sanctioned by reward and punishment. Ewald translates somewhat differently[6], but acknowledges that "word" and "commandment" mean revelation, saying in his note, "Who despises the *word*, that is, revelation and its doctrine, loses his true liberty." And again, xix. 16, "He that keepeth the commandment keepeth his own soul:

[6] "Wer das Wort verachtet, wird verpfändet ihm; doch wer da scheut Gebot, der wird bezahlt."

but he that despiseth his ways shall die." Here, again, "commandment" is used in the same sense and in the singular number, just as it is repeatedly in the Pentateuch to express the whole of revelation. Thus in Deut. viii. 1, "the whole commandment [not commandments, as in our English version] which I command thee this day ye shall observe to do." And again, vii. 11, "Thou shalt keep the commandment, both the statutes and the judgments." *The commandment* includes both the statutes and the judgments[7]. The promise, also, that the obedient shall live, and the transgressor die, is an allusion to the words of Moses, especially to Deut. xxx. 15: "I have set before thee life and good, death and evil." Bertheau, preferring the other reading (the Kthib), "He that despiseth his ways shall be put to death" (יוּמָת), finds another reference "to the common expression of the Mosaic law when it threatens capital punishment[8]." This reference to *life* and *death* is frequent, as in Prov. xi. 4. 19; x. 16; xviii. 21. The words in Prov. x. 27, "The fear of the Lord prolongeth days," is a direct reference to Deut. vi. 2. But besides these general references to the great sanctions of the Mosaic law, there are particular allusions to different places of the Penta-

[7] See also xi. 8. 22; xv. 5; xix. 9; xxvii. 1; xxx. 11.
[8] Comment. in loc.

teuch, as, for instance, to Gen. ii. Thus xiii. 12, "When the desire cometh, it is a tree of life;" xv. 4, "A wholesome tongue is a tree of life." Again, Prov. x. 18, "He that uttereth slander is a fool," uses the peculiar phraseology of the Pentateuch. The expression הוֹצִיא דִבָּה occurs only here and in Numb. xiii. 32; xiv. 36, 37. In like manner, x. 23, "It is sport to a fool to commit impurity" (זִמָּה), can only be understood by reference to Lev. xviii. 17; xix. 29. In Solomon's declaration, that "a false balance is an abomination to the Lord: but a just weight is his delight" (xi. 1); and again, "Divers weights and divers measures, both of them are an abomination to the Lord" (xx. 10. 23), the very words are taken from Lev. xix. 36, and Deut. xxv. 13. The expression, "abomination to the Lord," is particularly to be observed. It occurs again xv. 8. 26, and is taken from the Pentateuch, Lev. xviii. 22, xx. 13; Deut. vii. 26 xii. 31, &c. Again, the words, "He that walketh a talebearer (הוֹלֵךְ רָכִיל) revealeth secrets" (xi. 13, xx. 19), are taken from Lev. xix. 16, "Thou shalt not walk a talebearer among thy people," and do not occur elsewhere except Jer. vi. 28, and ix. 3. Again, in Prov. xi. 26, we have the verb *Shabar* (שָׁבַר) used in the sense "*to sell corn.*" In this sense it occurs in no book written before Proverbs, except in the Pentateuch, and there it is found frequently

both in Genesis and Deuteronomy. But here in Proverbs, the words, "Blessing shall be upon the head of him that selleth," contain a beautiful allusion to the blessing of Joseph, that great seller of corn, Gen. xlix. 26. Again, xvii. 15, "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord," is the very language of the Pentateuch, Exod. xxiii. 7, and Deut. xxv. 1. Again, xx. 20, "He that curseth father or mother," are the very words of Exod. xxi. 17. Again, xx. 25, "It is a snare to a man who devoureth that which is holy, and after vows to make inquiry," is a plain reference to Deut. xxiii. 21, "When thou vowest a vow, thou shalt not be slow to pay it," and to the numerous laws (Lev. xxvii. 9, 10. 14. 21) which forbid the alienation of any thing consecrated to the Lord.

These specimens (and more might be furnished) are sufficient to prove that both the contents and the language of the Pentateuch, as we possess it, were familiar to Solomon; and as from the history it is certain that a written Book of the Law existed in his days, this agreement in substance and diction proves beyond a doubt that our Pentateuch was extant in the days of the wise king; and if in the days of Solomon, then undoubtedly in the days of David and Samuel. Let us, then, see if there be traces in the books of Samuel and the Psalms of

David[9]. But here the references are so many, that we can only select a few. In the first place, there are several references to the coming up out of Egypt. In 1 Sam. xv. 2, we find in Samuel's address to Saul, "Thus saith the Lord, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way when he came out of Egypt;" and again, in the message of Saul to the Kenites (ver. 6), "Go, depart you, get you down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them; for ye shewed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt," the Exodus is distinctly mentioned; and the command to Saul, and Saul's message to the Kenites, are necessary parts of the narrative. The extirpation of the Amalekites is accounted for by the history of their ancient enmity and cruelty;

[9] In these days, when young gentlemen without study or learning set up for Biblical critics, and reject the Bible history, it may be well to quote the opinion of a veteran critic and rationalist, as to the Books of Samuel. In De Wette's Introduction, p. 263, § 178, he says:—"The narrative with a few exceptions bears a genuine historic impress, and is derived, in part at least, if not from contemporaneous records certainly from a lively and credible oral tradition (though occasionally obscure and confused), resting, it is true, in some places upon monuments, proverbs, and significant names .... It is so rich in living traits of character and descriptions, that it rivals in this respect the best historical writing and sometimes becomes biographic. The natural connexion of events is also very satisfactory, though not always made sufficiently prominent."

and the preservation of the Kenites by their former kindness. Both are connected with the coming up out of Egypt, and the historic narrative of the Pentateuch. A second feature in this history deserving of notice is, that Israel is described as having a public worship dependent upon a tabernacle and an ark of the covenant. The manner in which the ark is spoken of shows that it was well known. It is called "The ark of God" (1 Sam. iii. 3); "The ark" (1 Sam. vi. 13); "The ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts;" "The ark of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth between the cherubim" (1 Sam. iv. 3, 4). At the same time, these descriptions of the ark can only be understood by remembering what is told us in the Pentateuch, that there was a covenant between God and Israel; that the Ten Commandments are called the words of the covenant, and that stone tables of the covenant were deposited in the ark. The mention of the Cherubim, without any explanation, also refers the reader back to Exod. xxv. 18, xxxvii. 7, and Numb. vii. 89; and without these references we cannot tell who or what the Cherubim were. Then, as to the Tabernacle, we find that there were priests to minister and Levites to serve, and that the place of its location was visited annually by Israelites from a distance, as in the case of Elkanah and his family, a circumstance easily explained if we remember the commands in the

Pentateuch, and inexplicable without them. There were sacrifices, also, and the various observances relating to them agree minutely with the ordinances of the Pentateuch. In describing the wickedness of Eli's sons, the historian incidentally mentions the rites and ceremonies which they violated; and on considering them with attention, they agree exactly with what Moses had ordained. Thus, in chap. ii. 12, and following verses, it is said, "Now the sons of Eli were sons of Belial: they knew not the Lord. And the priests' custom with the people was, that when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant came, while the flesh was in seething, with a flesh-hook of three teeth in his hand, and he struck it into the pan or kettle or pot: all that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself. So they did in Shiloh with all the Israelites that came thither. Also before they burned the fat, the priest's servant came, and said to the man that sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest: for he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw. And if any man said, Let them not fail to burn the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth: then he would answer him, Nay, but thou shalt give it me now, and if not, I will take it by force." Now here are three transgressions described: first, that they took meat to which they had no right; secondly, that they took it in a wrong manner;

and, thirdly, that they took it at a wrong time. It is, therefore, evidently presupposed that the order to be observed had been fixed, and was well known. In the Pentateuch that order is described, and perfectly agrees with what is here related. First of all, a certain portion was appointed for the priest, and it was not to be taken by himself, but given by the sacrificer. See Deut. xviii. 3, and Lev. vii. 29. With this compare also the account of the peace-offerings contained in chap. iii., from which it appears that the burning of the fat was an essential part of the sacrifice, as it is said, ver. 3, "And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering an offering made by fire unto the Lord, the fat that covereth the inwards . . . . and Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt sacrifice, which is upon the wood that is upon the fire: it is an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord." The anxiety, therefore, of the sacrificer, as described in the book of Samuel, that they "should not fail to burn the fat presently," as well as the sin of Eli's sons, is explained by the ordinances of the Pentateuch; and yet it is quite evident that the mention of all these particulars is incidental, though a natural and necessary part of the narrative.

But as yet there is no mention of the Levites, not even when it is related that the ark of the covenant was conveyed to the camp of Israel to

help them against the Philistines. This appears an omission, but it is no contradiction; for in chap. vi. 15, where is related the return of the ark to Bethshemesh, they who are not alluded to before or after in the book, are described as being at their proper work. "The Levites took down the ark of the Lord." No explanation is given, who they are, or why they should do it? To understand the circumstance related, the command, Numb. i. 50, 51, is absolutely necessary.

In the account given in this book of the use to which the Ephod was applied, is contained one of the most convincing proofs of the existence and knowledge of the ordinances of the Pentateuch, and one of the best specimens of Dr. Hengstenberg's skill and diligence in investigating Scripture. In 1 Sam. xiv. 37, it is related that "Saul asked counsel of God." But how that was done we are not told; only we learn from verse 36, that the priest said, "Let us draw nigh hither unto God,"—and from verse 3, that Ahiah the son of Ahitub, was the Lord's priest in Shiloh "wearing an ephod." In chap. xxii. 9, Doeg tells Saul, that Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, had inquired of the Lord; and from chap. xxiii. we know that he did so by means of an ephod. In verses 2, 3, we are told that David twice inquired of the Lord, and in the following verses this is explained: "It came to pass, when

Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, fled to David to Keilah, that he came down with an ephod in his hand." And at ver. 9 we are told, that when David knew that Saul secretly practised mischief against him, he said to Abiathar, "Bring hither the ephod." Then it is said, that David inquired and the Lord answered him; and again, in xxx. 7, 8, David said to Abiathar, "I pray thee, bring me hither the ephod. And Abiathar brought hither the ephod to David, and David inquired at the Lord." Now here is an use of the ephod not mentioned in the Pentateuch, in any of the passages where the making and purpose of the ephod are described. Numb. xxvii. 21 helps to solve the difficulty and explain the mystery. There, speaking of Joshua as Moses' successor, it is said, "And he shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim before the Lord." Here, the mode of asking counsel, namely, by the Urim, is made known, but there is no mention of the ephod. Exod. xxviii. 30 informs us, that the Urim and Thummim were in the priest's breastplate; and ver. 28, that this breastplate was inseparable from the ephod. "They shall bind the breastplate by the rings thereof unto the rings of the ephod with a lace of blue, that it may be above the curious girdle of the ephod, and that the breastplate be not loosed from the ephod." When, therefore, Abiathar

brought the ephod, he brought also the breast-plate of judgment, and therefore the Urim and Thummim, by means of which the answer was given. Thus, the incidental mention of the ephod requires and presupposes an intimate knowledge of the ordinances of the Pentateuch, not found together, but scattered about in various places of that book. At the same time it is to be observed that the historian, though he does not mention the Urim and Thummim here, does mention them expressly in chap. xxviii. 6, where he says, that "when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." There are allusions to many other ordinances of the Pentateuch, as 1 Sam. xxi. 3, 4; to the difference between the common bread and the shewbread Lev. xxiv. 5, &c. Exod. xxv. 30. In 1 Sam xiv. 32, to the prohibition to eat blood, Lev vii. 26, and xvii. 10. 1 Sam. xx. 5. 18. 27, t the feast of the new moon: in ver. 26 also, t Deut. xxiii. 11, and Levit. vii. 20, and xv. 5. —11. In 1 Sam. xxviii. 3, to the Pentateucha prohibition against consulting those who ha familiar spirits, Deut. xviii. 10, 11, and Lev xx. 27, &c. In fact, in this book we fin all these ordinances of the Pentateuch: Th tabernacle of the congregation, the ark of th covenant, the yearly visitation, the rejoicing wit the whole household, the duties of the priest

and Levites, the altar, the incense and the ephod, the Urim and Thummim, the priests' dues, and the manner in which they were to be received, the inquiring of the Lord by the priests, the new moon, the laws concerning ceremonial uncleanness, wizards and possessors of familiar spirits; and many of those described in the exact and peculiar language of the Pentateuch: and when to this we add, that the Pentateuch existed in the days of Solomon, to what other conclusion can we come, than that it existed in the days of David also?

But, side by side with these historic records, there was from the time of David a series of hymns used in the public worship of Israel's God, and in the private devotions of His worshippers; and the total impression left by their perusal is, that the sweet singers of Israel were thoroughly imbued with the sentiments and the language of the Pentateuch. Many of them sing the praises of the Law of the Lord, and many more refer to the history and the great principles of the Pentateuch, so that if judged after the manner of human writings, one would say that the Pentateuch is the source and parent of that devotional literature which stands alone in the history of the ancient world. This grand impression no microscopic criticism can remove. The devotions of Israel all testify to the existence and power of the Pentateuch. At the same time, a similar

testimony may be elicited from those Psalms which confessedly belong to the times of David and Solomon. Thus, the eighth Psalm is an echo of the very words of Genesis i. Ps. xxix. 10, "The Lord sat at the deluge (Mabbul), and sitteth a king for ever," is an unmistakable reference to the narrative of Genesis. The word Mabbul, *deluge*, is used only in these two places of the Bible. Ps. xi. 6, "Upon the wicked he raineth snares (coals), fire, and brimstone," is an obvious reference to the history and language of Gen. xix. Ps. cx. 4, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec," to Gen. xiv. Melchisedec is nowhere else mentioned in the Old Testament. The epithets of God in the Psalms also show knowledge of the Pentateuch. Thus, Ps. cxxxii. 1, "The mighty one of Jacob," occurs only in the Pentateuch, Gen. xlix. 24, before the time of David. "The God of Jacob," Ps. xx. 1, and "The God of Israel," refer to the history of Jacob, and the change of his name. The sixty-eighth Psalm describes the majesty of God, by a reference to the wonders of Egypt, the wilderness, and the giving of the Law at Sinai; and begins with the very words of Numb. x. 35. Ps. cxxxii. 8, 9 contains references to the ark, the holy garments of the priests, Exod. xl. 13, and the joyful shout of the people, Lev. ix. 24. Verse 12 refers to the covenant and the testimony, that is, the law. Ps. l. refers to "the

statutes" as well as to the covenant by sacrifice. To enter into a discussion as to the authorship of other Psalms, which testify still more strongly as to the existence of the Book of the Law, is not possible here, nor is it necessary. Enough has been said to show, that in the days of David, Samuel, and Eli, the Pentateuch was known; and if so, it must have existed in the days of the Judges, and of its existence there are plain traces in the

BOOKS OF RUTH AND JUDGES.

The nature of these documents forbids us to expect a detailed narrative of the progress of religion, or of the rites and observances of public worship. The book of Ruth is a family record, a sketch from private life. The book of Judges is a collection of memoirs of the remarkable persons, whom the Lord raised up to defend or to deliver the invaded provinces of Israel, not even an outline of the history of the whole nation. Allusion therefore to priests or religious laws, or even to those parts of the land not similarly exposed, must be few and incidental. Those that do occur are the more satisfactory and convincing. The first thing to be observed with regard to these books is, that the fundamental principle of the Pentateuch, the dependence of blessing or cursing on obedience or disobedience, is the hinge

on which every particular history turns. This is the binding principle that holds all these separate narratives together. The prosperity of a poor Moabitish widow and the success of armies are made to depend upon the fear of the true God, and the practice of the true religion. National calamity is the consequence of disobedience. God is the God of Israel, and rewards or punishes: The LORD who revealed himself on Sinai, as Deborah tells us, in that wonderful song, which Ewald and others admit to be the genuine work of the prophetess[1]. In the next place, we find such a state of things as would naturally have arisen from knowledge of the Pentateuch. There was a congregation (עדה), also a tabernacle of the congregation, here called the house of God, as in Samuel, Judges xx. 18—and an ark of the covenant of God, ver. 27—and the practice of inquiring of the Lord, ver. 18 and 28—and a priest to make the inquiry, ver. 28—and Levites consecrated to the service of God, xvii. 13, xix. 1—and an ephod, xvii. 4 (Heb.)—and burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, xx. 26, and Nazarites, xiii. 5. 7, and a yearly feast, xxi. 19, where the words used refer to the passover—and the duty of marrying a brother's widow, and the punishment of him who refused, Ruth iv.—and the obligation to redeem, iv. 3—5—and the pro-

[1] Judges v. 4.

hibition to marry the heathen (Judges xiv. 3)—and to eat that which is unclean, which caused Samson to conceal from his father and mother whence he got the honey, xiv. 9—and the belief in the inalienability of that which was solemnly devoted to the Lord, xi. 35—and the duty of overthrowing idol-altars, vi. 28;—and all these things mentioned in the language of the Pentateuch, testify to its existence in the days of the Judges, and bring us back to the time of Phinehas the son of Eleazar, who was himself an eye-witness of the giving of the Law, and the Lord's dealings in the wilderness [2].

The book of Joshua also gives the same evidence. But as without it we have traced the existence of the Pentateuch to a contemporary of Joshua and Moses, and as the controversies respecting the Book of Joshua would require much discussion, it is necessary to stop here for the present. The Pentateuch which we possess has been traced from the present time to the days when it was written; it must therefore be genuine. No apparent difficulties are sufficient to shake the testimony of the prophets and the historic books. In a book so ancient there may be many diffi-

[2] Concerning these latter chapters Bleek says,—"The liveliness of the representation and unmistakable accuracy of the narratives show that they are based upon trustworthy tradition, and make it probable that they were committed to writing at no very late period."

culties arising from the brevity of the narrative, from our ignorance of all the circumstances, from the errors of transcribers, &c., and some of them may be beyond the power of solution in the present day. But they who urge them as objections against the genuineness, or authenticity, are bound to account for the existence of the testimonies to which we have referred, and satisfactorily to set them aside before they ask us to reject what rests upon such an accumulation of evidence. The testimonies adduced can be examined by every reader of the English Bible. An attentive reader may find many more; and sure I am that he, who will take the trouble of patiently studying the Scriptures, from Malachi to Joshua, in reference to this subject, will arrive at the firm conviction that there never was a time in Israel from the days of Moses on, when the Pentateuch was unknown.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

But the Christian has still stronger reasons for believing in the genuineness and Divine origin of the Pentateuch. He has the testimony of the Son of God and His inspired Apostles. And here it is to be observed, in the first place, that our Lord and His Apostles speak of the Pentateuch in the language common to the Jews in all times, as "The Law." Sometimes this expression was

used of the Old Testament. But when spoken of in connexion with the other portions as, "The Law and the Prophets[3]," or, "The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms[4]," it means the five books attributed to Moses. In the next place it is to be noted, that our Lord, the Evangelists, and the Apostles regard the Law as a Divine Revelation, and therefore possessing a Divine authority. By St. Luke ii. 23, 24. 39, it is called "The Law of the Lord." St. Paul (Romans vii. 22) calls it "The Law of God." He also teaches that obedience to the Law gives life, transgression entails death (Rom. vii. 7—11, compare Gal. iii. 10). Again, when St. Paul cites the words of the Pentateuch, he ascribes them to God; for example, "God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them," 2 Cor. vi. 16, compared with Lev. xxvi. 11, 12. In like manner St. John describes sin as the transgression of the Law, "Whosoever committeth sin, transgresseth also the law" (1 John iii. 4, compare James ii. 8). The whole system of New Testament doctrine concerning salvation, the guilt of man, the curse of the Law, and redemption by the blood of Christ, rests upon the supposition that the Law is a Divine Revelation. In like manner the whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews con-

[3] Matt. v. 17, 18; vii. 12; xi. 13; xxii. 40. Luke xvi. 16.

[4] Luke xxiv. 44.

cerning Christ's priesthood, the nature of His atonement, the typification of the Gospel in Levitic ordinances, necessarily presupposes the Divine origin of the Law. Heb. viii. 5; x. 1, &c. Our Lord also ascribes Divine authority to the Law. He refers to it as the highest authority, Matt. xii. 5, and Luke x. 25, 26; and speaks of its precepts as "The commandments of God," Matt. xv. 3. According to our Lord's teaching, the Law is so entirely Divine, that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one jot or tittle of the law to fail" (Luke xvi. 16, 17) and therefore is to be violated by none. Matt. v. 19, "Whosoever shall break (or, weaken the authority, λύσῃ) of one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven. But whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." To assert the Divine authority of the Law more strongly, is impossible.

In the third place, it is to be observed, that our Lord and His Apostles taught that the Pentateuch was given by Moses, that he was the penman and wrote the laws as given him by God. Thus the word "Moses" is frequently put instead of "the Law." So St. Luke says, xxiv. 27, "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Again, our Lord says

Luke xvi. 29, "They have Moses and the prophets—if they hear not Moses and the prophets." In these places the name of Moses is put for what Moses wrote, as "The prophets," for their writings. Still stronger is what the Lord says, John vii. 19, "Did not Moses give you the law?" In Luke ii. 22, and Acts xv. 5, it is called "The Law of Moses." Our Lord Himself says, "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses" (compare Acts xxviii. 23, and xiii. 39). It may, however, be said that the Pentateuch is called Moses, and the Law of Moses, because it contains the history and some commands of Moses, on which was based the subsequent legislation, but that these expressions do not necessarily imply that Moses wrote the books. But the New Testament goes farther, and states distinctly that the books were written by Moses. In Matt. xxii. 24 the Jews said to our Lord, "Moses said." In John viii. 5, "Moses in the law commanded us," and in Mark xii. 19, and Luke xx. 28, "Moses wrote unto us." The Lord, in His reply, confirms this opinion as to the authorship of the law, saying, "Have ye not read in the book of Moses?" Mark xii. 26. In the parallel passage, Luke xx. 37, our Lord says, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham," &c. Moses can only be said to call God by that title by being

the historian of what God had called Himself. The historian calls God the God of Abraham. Moses, therefore, was the historian; and, therefore, our Lord also says to the Jews, Mark vii. 10, "Moses said, Honour thy father and mother," and again, when speaking of divorce, Mark x. 5, "For the hardness of your heart, he wrote you this precept;" and, in like manner, John v. 46, 47, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (Compare John i. 45, 46; Acts iii. 22.) St. James says, in like manner, "Moses is read in the synagogue every Sabbath day" (Acts xv. 21). St. Paul says, Rom. x. 5, "Moses writeth (γράφει) the righteousness of the law," referring to Lev. xviii. 5. It is evident, therefore, that our Lord and His Apostles regarded the Pentateuch as the law of Moses, the book of Moses, the writings of Moses.

Fourthly, it appears also, that they received the history which that book contains as true and authentic, the miraculous and supernatural as well as that which is according to the common course of nature. Thus, in Mark x. 9, the Lord refers to the creation of Adam and Eve as historically true; and on the words of Adam founds His own command—"What, *therefore* God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" In Matt. xxiv. 37, He refers to the

deluge, the destruction of the world, and the preservation of Noah. In Luke xvii. 32, to the fire and brimstone which destroyed Sodom and the cities of the plain, and the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt. So He refers to the appearance of God in the burning bush; the miraculous effect of looking at the brazen serpent; and the miraculous supply of manna, as typical of Himself, where the comparison necessarily implies the truth of the fact (John iii. 14; vi. 49—51). Stephen repeats almost word for word the history of Abraham's miraculous call, the birth of Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve Patriarchs, the miraculous circumstances of the Exodus, and the giving of the Law (Acts vii.). St. Paul compares the first and second Adam, and refers to the creation of the former from the dust of the earth (1 Cor. xv. 21, &c.), and to the creation of the woman (1 Cor. xi. 7—9). He also refers to the temptation by the serpent, and the transgression of the woman, as real history (2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14); and in Rom. v. 12 founds an argument upon the fact that death entered by sin. In Rom. iv. 19 he refers to the miraculous conception and birth of Isaac; and, in ix. 10—13, to the election of Jacob and the rejection of Esau, as true history. He makes the Passover the ground of an exhortation to holiness (1 Cor. v. 7, 8), and presses upon the attention of the Corinthians the passage

through the Red Sea, the guidance of the pillar and cloud, as well as the miraculous supply of water; and upon that most miraculous trait in the history of the manna, that he that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack, he founds directions respecting the exercise of charity (2 Cor. viii. 15). In 1 Cor. x. 8 he refers to Baal Peor; and in 2 Cor. iii. 13, to the miraculous glory in the countenance of Moses. He evidently receives the whole as inspired, authentic, and authoritative; holy, just, and good; a schoolmaster unto Christ; when the one object of his life, to preach justification by faith without the law, would naturally have led him to depreciate its authority, if he had not been instructed by the Spirit to receive it as a Divine revelation. Again, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi. reference is made to the Mosaic history from Cain and Abel to the passage of the Red Sea, as well as to the circumstances of awe and majesty under which the Law was given (Heb. xii. 18—21); to the wanderings and death of the rebellious Israelites (Heb. iii. 7—19), and the early institution of the Sabbath. St. James refers to the offering of Isaac (ii. 21); and St. Peter points to the example of Sarah (1 Pet. iii. 6), to the deliverance of Noah (2 Pet. ii. 5. 9. 15); the destruction of Sodom; and the dumb ass rebuking the madness of the prophet

These direct references, not now to speak of the numberless allusions to the Pentateuch in all the writings of the New Testament, prove that Christ, and the Apostles to whom He gave the Spirit to guide them into all truth, did not accommodate themselves to the popular belief of the Jews; but knew, and heartily believed in, the truth, the Divine origin and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Christ's omniscience and the working of the Spirit of Truth in the Apostles, are sufficient warrant for the faith of every Christian man. Whether he can solve difficulties or not, he has the infallible testimony of Christ and His inspired Apostles, and that is an answer to all objectors. He feels that he cannot reject the Pentateuch without renouncing his faith in his Saviour. Christ Himself has stated the indissoluble connexion between faith in the Pentateuch and faith in Himself. "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Bishop Colenso has proved in his own person the truth of the Saviour's appeal. He first rejects the Pentateuch; he then robs Christ of His Deity, by denying His Omniscience. According to him, Christ's knowledge as to "the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch" did not "surpass that of the most pious and learned of His nation[5]." In perfect

[5] Preface, p. xxxi.

consistency with these sentiments, when he rejects Moses and the Pentateuch, he does not ask us, in order to fill up the aching void, to fall back upon Christ and the Gospels, but upon the theology of the Sikh Gooroos, and other heathen, "who had no Pentateuch or Bible to teach" them. And this is, in fact, the drift of the new theology, to bring us back to scientific heathenism. Bishop Colenso has spoken out what others have been mumbling in dark sentences. But whilst it is possible to contrast the condition of Christendom with that of the Hindoos, the Chinese of the present day, or the great nations of classical antiquity,—the republic of Moses with the republic of Plato—the power of Christ's doctrine with the effects of the teaching of Socrates,—we think it more agreeable to reason as well as to piety, to refuse the new heathenizing theories; to abide by the old catholic doctrine, and hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints.

THE END.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

Date Due

APR 1 0 1997

BS1225 .4 .C7M12
An examination of Bp. colenso's
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00012 1626